THE BIBLICAL TEXT IN THE MAKING

GORDIS

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
DEC 2 1937
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BS1185
.G66

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
DEC 2 1937
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

THE BIBLICAL TEXT IN THE MAKING

A STUDY OF THE KETHIB-QERE

BY

ROBERT GORDIS, Ph.D.

PHILADELPHIA

THE DROPSIE COLLEGE FOR HEBREW AND COGNATE LEARNING

1937

Copyright 1937, by
ROBERT GORDIS

PRINTED IN
THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
PRESS OF THE JEWISH PUBLICATION SOCIETY
PHILADELPHIA, PENNA.

לעילוי נשמת אמי

לאה בת ר' ראובן נ"ע

ולכבוד אבי מורי יח'

ר' חיים אריה ב"ר פסח

שעמלו ויגעו לנטוע בלבי אהבת התורה והחכמה

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER I — THE PROBLEM OF THE KETHIB-QERE 7
The history of the discussion — Views advanced.

CHAPTER II — OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED THEORIES 15
The theory of manuscript variants — The correction hypothesis — The eclectic view — The mystical theory.

CHAPTER III — THE ORIGINAL CLASSES OF KETHIB-QERE 29
The guides to the Reader — The Tetragrammaton as a Kethib-Qere — The avoidance of obscenity — The pre-history of Hebrew vocalization — The Qere as a guide against misreading.

CHAPTER IV — THE LATER CLASSES OF KETHIB-QERE 40
The problem of textual variations — Masoretic technique — Conflation — Dotted words — The archetype — Its date and character — The earliest manuscript collation — The Kethib-Qere as early textual variants — The quotations in the Mishnah and Talmud.

CHAPTER V — THE TESTIMONY OF THE VERSIONS 55
Methods of utilization of the Versions — The evidence from errors in translation — The Septuagint — Symmachus — Theodotion — Aquila Aramaic Targums — Peshitta — Vulgate — Tables.

CHAPTER VI — THE MINOR CLASSES OF KETHIB-QERE 67
The continuance of variations — Individual aberrations of scribes — The Kethib-Qere of the Oriental and Occidental Schools — The evidence of the Versions — The homiletic use of the Kethib-Qere formula.

APPENDIX A — THE DETAILED RESULTS OF THE ANALYSIS 82

APPENDIX B — THE CLASSIFICATION OF THE KETHIB-QERE WITH INTRODUCTIONS 83

APPENDIX C — THE MADINCHAE KETHIB-QERE CLASSIFIED 159
Notes to the Classification 167

INDEX TO KETHIB-QERE PASSAGES 207

INDEX TO MADINCHAE KETHIB-QERE PASSAGES 214

INDEX TO BIBLICAL PASSAGES 216

INDEX TO RABBINIC PASSAGES 217

GENERAL INDEX 218

INTRODUCTION

The mystics inform us that "Everything depends on luck, even the Scroll in the Temple". In these words they have unconsciously epitomized the fate of the Masorah, that branch of Jewish literature which was concerned with preserving and transmitting the Biblical text through the centuries. Scarcely any other phase of Jewish literary activity is as little known or understood as the Masorah. Those humble but indomitable workers, to whom later generations referred by the collective title of Baale Masorah, Masters of Tradition, performed in obscurity their herculean task of guarding the Biblical Text against loss or variation. Their names, the period of their activity, and the precise nature of their work, all are veiled in darkness, relieved only by faint glimmerings of light. Their ceaseless effort to protect the Biblical text produced highly important by-products: the various systems of vocalization, the invention of the accents, the fixing of the orthography, and the general determination of the accepted text of Scripture. All this presupposes vast progress, of which we know very little, in the fields of grammar and exegesis. These signal achievements were tacitly accepted by the Jewish people, and secondarily by the Christian Church, as normative, but no attempt was made to note for an interested posterity the authors or the workings of the process.

Centuries went by, and there came a recrudescence of interest in the Masorah and its builders. In the fifteenth, sixteenth, and the seventeenth centuries the study of the Masorah reached its height. The imposing fence about the letters of the Law which the Masoretes had erected was now studied with zeal and unflagging enthusiasm. But with the end of the seventeenth

century, the study of the Masorah suffered an eclipse that lasted for more than a hundred years. Beginning with the middle of the nineteenth century, a revival of interest took place. Through the efforts of Frensdorff, Pinsker, Baer, Strack, Ginsburg, Kahle, and others, a vast amount of progress was made in this branch of inquiry. Today the Masorah bids fair to regain its honored place among Biblical studies.

Nevertheless, little has been done in modern times to solve the problem of one of the most characteristic and interesting phenomena of the Masorah, the Kethib-Qere.[1] In almost fifteen hundred passages, the Masorah demands that one word be written (Kethib) in the text, while another word must be read (Qere) in its stead. In dealing with the origin and nature of these variant readings, most modern scholars have contented themselves with repeating at second hand the theories of their medieval predecessors, which had the virtue at least of having been evolved at first hand.

The aim of this work is to investigate the problem of the K Q de novo and to present some new conclusions. Chapter I contains a brief sketch of the history of this question, which was of great interest to medieval scholars. One theory as to the nature and origin of the Kethib-Qere, which gained wide currency, insisted that the KQ were conflicting readings due to varying manuscripts. On the other hand, a second group of scholars energetically maintained that the Q were corrections by the Masoretes of the written text, the Kethib. The objections to both views were so apparent that an eclectic theory came into vogue, proposed by Capellus and still favored by many scholars today,

[1] The Kethib is frequently abbreviated throughout this work as K, or כ and the Qere as Q or ק. The plural of the latter is sometimes given as Qarian. The Hebrew and English abbreviations of Biblical books will be found in the List of Abbreviations preceding the Classification.

which attempted to combine both opinions, and so avoid the difficulties of either.

In Chapter II, the objections to these theories are discussed. Thus the variation-hypothesis in its accepted form is unable to account for the unusual term "Kethib-Qere", and cannot explain a large number of phenomena within the Kethib-Qere corpus itself. Even more evident are the difficulties of the correction-theory. To assume wholesale correction on the part of the Masoretes, betrays ignorance of their entire purpose and method, which was the conservation of the text, not its emendation. This consideration is borne out by an examination of the various categories of KQ. Thus there are large groups of instances where a word is Kethib in one passage and hence is changed, while in another passage, it itself is Qere; or where the Kethib, though modified in one verse by a Qere, is left unchanged in others, or where the Qere creates a hapax legomenon. These and similar cases are indisputable evidence that the Q cannot be a correction of the K. Indeed, a study of all the KQ, the details of which are set forth in the appended Classification, shows that only in 18% of the entire number is the Q a better reading than the K, while in 12% the K is to be preferred to the Q, and in 62% the K and the Q are equally satisfactory. Other arguments against the correction-hypothesis are then invoked and the general deficiency of the theory is laid bare.

In Chapter III a genetic theory of the KQ is proposed, the point of departure of which is the literal and original sense of the term Kethib-Qere. Attention is called to the ancient practice of substituting Adonai for the Tetragrammaton, as well as to the group of euphemistic KQ variations. It is therefore maintained that in its first stage the Q was a guide to the synagogue Reader against blasphemy and indecency of expression. More-

over, in the absence of a vocalic system, there was great danger of error in reading, due to the vowelless spelling of the Biblical text. It is suggested that the Q was next used as a guide to the correct reading in the period before the invention of the vowel-signs. This is proved by examples culled from Masoretic literature. All these groups, totalling a very large percentage of the entire number, may be described as the *original classes of the KQ* (*Lists 1-8*).

In Chapter IV the later stage in the use of the KQ is described. The problem of preventing variation and error faced the earliest guardians of the Biblical text. Traces of the means they had adopted are still to be found, and these are now discussed. An attempt is made to show that these methods manifest a constantly increasing refinement in technique, though they did not prove permanently satisfactory.

Hence the final attempt to stem the tide of variation was the adoption of one manuscript as the norm or archetype, by which all other codices were to be corrected and from which copies were to be made. This conclusion has been accepted by scholars on independent grounds, but we suggest that it offers the explanation of the origin of the *later classes of KQ*. When this archetypal codex was adopted, good readings of other reputable manuscripts were noted on the margin, and these are now our Q, while the K, in these instances, is the text of the archetype. These variational KQ constitute Lists 9-85.

The date when this standard code was adopted, is then discussed, and the commonly accepted one (135 C.E.) is rejected. For reasons given within the body of the book, it would seem that this epoch-making choice must antedate the destruction of the Temple (70 C.E.). The antiquity of these KQ variations is also attested by the existence of many of these Qarian before

the Septuagint translators, as well as by various quotations in the Mishnah.

Chapter V is concerned with the relation of the Ancient Versions to the KQ. It is pointed out that it is often very difficult, if not altogether impossible, to decide which reading a particular version follows. The reaction of each translation to every instance of the KQ is given, and the results are summarized in tabular form.

Chapter VI traces the later history of variations in the Biblical text. The archetype was lost or destroyed, and though copies of it may have been common, variations remained, indeed increased, with every copyist who wrote a Bible manuscript. Some of these variants were cast in the KQ formula, but were never generally recognized as genuine by Masoretic authorities. A far more important group of these later variants were those accepted by entire Masoretic schools, such as the Madinchae (Orientals) or the Maarbee (Occidentals). That these readings are much older than these schools, and were undoubtedly current in manuscripts centuries earlier, is proved by recourse to the versions. In differing degrees, the Septuagint, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, the Peshitta, Vulgate, and the Aramaic Targums, have incorporated readings that were later adopted by one or another school. Naturally enough, the Babylonian Talmud has the Oriental reading several times.

In addition, the chapter contains a discussion of a hitherto unrecognized use of the KQ formula — as a homiletic device. Many alleged discrepancies between Masorah and Rabbinic literature thus fall away.

The Classification, which now follows, contains all the KQ of the Bible arranged in groups according to their nature and origin. The relative value of the KQ is gauged, the grounds for

the decision being given in the notes. The preference of the versions for the K or the Q, as the case may be, is indicated by appropriate sigla. The lists are usually preceded by introductions, where relevant problems of orthography, grammar and exegesis are discussed. This Classification is the essential part of the investigation, the preceding chapters being based upon it. It remains to note that the vocalization of the Kethib is in no sense official; it is the author's conception of how the K is to be read. It is added to facilitate comparison of the relative merits of the K and the Q. The vocalization of the Q, of course, is that of the Masorah.

Full acknowledgment to all my teachers and friends, who, directly or indirectly, have furthered this study, is an impossibility. That this work has seen the light of day is due to the encouragement and interest of Doctor Cyrus Adler, the President of both my "almae matres", Dropsie College and the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, who found time in his incredibly crowded schedule to concern himself with my book and its problems. This work, the result of my study under Professor Max L. Margolis, would be incomplete without a word of tribute to this outstanding scholar and superb teacher, whose life was a symbol of unswerving devotion to the quest for truth. It is also a source of deep gratification that this book has been enriched by the suggestions and criticisms of one of the greatest scholars of our generation, Professor Louis Ginzberg, whom I am honored to call my teacher and friend. It goes without saying that responsibility for the views expressed attaches only to the writer.

Deeply conscious of the imperfections of this study, I hope that it will contribute, in some slight degree, to a truer understanding of the role of the Masorah, in preserving and transmitting the precious message of the Book of Books.

Chapter One

THE PROBLEM OF THE KQ

In the printed Hebrew Bibles of today, a considerable number of words occur where the vowels do not correspond to the consonantal text, as e. g. La 3:9 אֲרִיָה where the consonants form the noun אֲרִיֵה, and the vowels belong to the word אֲרִי. The former word, the consonants of which are written, is termed the Kethib; the latter word, which is to be read, though not written, is termed the Qere.[1] By this ingenious, but somewhat confusing device, the two variations, the K and the Q, are given without any marginal references, and yet are plain to the initiated reader. This method, however, is merely the latest evolved for transmitting K and Q variations. Originally, each Q was placed in the margin of the manuscript, near the word affected, while the K was left unvocalized in the text.[2] This procedure was followed by Ginsburg in his editions of the Bible. The Rabbinic Bibles (Mikraoth Gedoloth) which are reprints of Jacob bar Hayyim ibn Adonijah's second Bomberg Bible (Venice 1524–1525) follow both procedures, that is they give the K in the text with the

[1] The traditional pronunciation *Qri* is due to the unvocalized spelling, where the Yod is taken as a Hireq, and to the phonetic analogy of *Kethib*. The word is undoubtedly to be read either as an imperative, *Qere*, "Read so!" (cf. *al tiqre*) or as a participle passive, *Qere*, parallel to *Kethib*) with gerundive force, *legendum est*, "to be read so!" The first alternative seems preferable, though the meaning is identical.

[2] See Ginsburg: Intr. to Massoretico-Critical Text of the Hebrew Bible. p. 184. Also E. Ehrentreu—Untersuchungen Ueber die Masorah, page 35. Mit grosser Wahrscheinlichkeit ist anzunehmen dass die Masorahbemerkungen die Grundlage zu den Masorahlisten bildeten und dennoch ein höheres Alter als letztere besitzen.

vowels of the Q beneath it, and in the margin they again register the Q unvocalized, as, for example ארי ק'.

These scattered K and Q were gathered into widely varying lists by scribes for each book of the Bible. Other rubrics were based on some common property, such as (Ochlah V'ochlah, no. 91 and 111, respectively)

ס"ב מלין דכתבן מוקדם ומאוחר
כ"ט מלין חסר ה' בסוף תיבותן וקריין

It must be remembered, however, that originally these variations were transmitted in the form of marginal notes, which contained only the *consonants of the Qere*, followed by the letter Koph, denoting Qere. The importance of this fact will become apparent in a later stage of the discussion.

Regarding the *number* of these variations there is no unanimity. Buhl[3] speaks of "1314 passages according to the Masorah". On the other hand, Levita established 848 as the correct number, the Gematria of *Qarian uKethiban*! Capellus found 1548 examples in Jacob B. Hayyim's Bible, and 1566 in Plantin Antwerp edition. Morinus found in the former edition 1544.[4] Our own result is 1350, based on a collation of Baer and Ginsburg[5] with constant use of Jacob b. Hayyim's Masorah marginalis and Norzi's Minhath Shai, together with the extensive lists in Ginsburg's "The Masorah", letter Kaph, lists no. 488 ff. Our number, too, can make no claim to finality, because there are hundreds of KQ which are rejected by one or more authorities; in all these cases only a complete manuscript collation could make

[3] F. Buhl: Canon and Text of the Old Testament, p. 39. So also Rosenfeld.

[4] See Carpzov: Critica Sacra. p. 346 and the slightly divergent figures in M. Hiller: De Arcano Kethib et Keri. p. 223.

[5] For Ginsburg his larger Bible was used throughout the Pentateuch, Prophets and Psalms. (1913–1926). For the remainder of the Hagiographa. his smaller Bible (1909) was used in the collation.

a definite decision possible. Inasmuch as our endeavor is not to ascertain the exact number of the KQ, but rather to investigate their nature and history, these slight discrepancies will not affect the nature of our work.

Far more important and perplexing is the question of the *origin and nature* of the KQ. When did they originate? Are they corrections or variations, or both? How may they be classified? Answers have been plentiful and various,[6] but none are completely adequate, as will become clear in the course of the discussion.

The earliest recorded opinion in the field was that the KQ represent manuscript variations. Thus Profiat Duran[7] maintains: Ezra and those who came after him, when in doubt as to the original text because of conflicting manuscripts, established the KQ as a sign of their doubt in regard to the original reading.[8] Kimhi, in his introduction to his Commentary on the Former Prophets, amplified this view, by assuming that the cause for this deterioration of manuscripts and the dearth of scholars was the Babylonian exile, and it was this which led to the variations which we now know as the K and the Q.[9]

Among Christians this view was ardently defended by the Buxtorfs who adopted the view with no essential change from their Jewish predecessors.[10] In 1692 there appeared Matthew

[6] For the older literature see J. G. Carpzov: op. cit. (1728) p. 328 note, whose general discussion pp. 328–357 is by far the most complete. Cf. also the additional references in H. L. Strack: Prolegomena Critica in V. T. H. p. 80 and notes 161, 164, 166.

[7] In Maaseh Ephod, chap. 7 — also quoted by ibn Adonijah in his Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible and extensively requoted.

[8] עזרא והבאים אחריו . . . במקומות אשר השינם ההפסד והבלבול עשו הקרי והכתיב להיותו מסופק במה שמצא.

[9] החכמים . . . מצאו מחלוקת בספרים והלכו בהם אחר הרוב לפי דעתם על בירור כתבו האחד ולא נקדוהו או כתבו מבחוץ ולא כתבו מבפנים וכן כתבו בדרך אחד ובדרך אחר מבפנים.

[10] The elder Buxtorf in Tiberias VIII, II; the younger Buxtorf in Anti-Criticae, part II, chapter 4.

Hiller's "De Arcano Kethib et Keri" with a commendatory epistle to Leibniz, and other valuable features. Rejecting the view that errors could lie at the basis of the KQ, he proposed a novel theory. Ezra, in the interest of greater vividness and variety of style, when writing two or more codices, would exchange one word for another of synonymous force.[11] These variations were later recopied into one manuscript, one as the K and one as the Q. His contention that the K and the Q are always identical in meaning, leads him to far-fetched conclusions. Thus *lo* with Aleph and *lo* with Vav, he maintains, are really identical, because Aleph and Vav are interchangeable![12] Moreover, it is inconceivable that the sacred text of Scripture would be modified to suit the literary whim of scribes. Lastly, his classification is open to another objection, namely, its mechanical nature. It is true that the Masorah likewise lists the KQ according to merely superficial resemblances as e. g. (Ochla, 113) "14 words written with He and read with Vav at the end" or (ibid. 91) "62 words with metathesis." But these rubrics were intended merely as mechanical guides to a correct text, not as investigations into their nature. Thus to Hiller חֻקְךָ Ps 74:11 and יְכַסֻּמוּ Ps 140:10 belong to the same classification.[13] The same criticism may be levelled against Elijah Levita's classification of the KQ into seven groups, which is also based purely on external resemblances.[14]

[11] Nimirum, diversarum scriptionum autorem Esdram facimus, qui volumina sacra bis aut amplius exarando vel recensendo vocem voce *isodynamo* interdum permutavit. op. cit. p. 13.

[12] Thus I Sam. 2:3 where the *Kethib* is translated "et illi." Op. cit. p. 60 ff.

[13] Ibid. p. 115. In our own lists they will be found in widely different categories, lists no. 46 and 62.

[14] Masoreth ha Masoreth II, I. The same error is committed by Bamberger, Die Bedeutung des Kethib-Qere p. 221 et seq.

Hiller's work won little consent among scholars, but the theory that the KQ were manuscript variations found its strong and energetic defender in J. G. Carpzov's lucid and systematic work "Critica Sacra". In an elaborate discussion,[15] he classified the views of his predecessors and then proceeded to lay down his own theory. With the exception of the euphemisms and a few lapses on the part of the scribes like the *Kethib vela Qere* and *Qere vela Kethib*, that were incorporated later or contemporaneously into the main body of KQ, they were all manuscript variations. He rejects the view of Brian Walton and Richard Simon that the Masoretes who flourished after the Talmudic period are the authors of the KQ, because these variations are already met with in the Talmud.[16] Carpzov fixes upon the persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes as the period when the correct codices were destroyed.[17] After 164 B.C. then, begins the task of reconstructing the text, and the variations in the then extant manuscripts are the sources of our K and Q.

This view was taken up by Eichhorn and various modern scholars including Gesenius, DeWette, Dillmann, and Koenig.[18] This is also the opinion of Frankel,[19] who claims that the K is the variation of the lesser number of manuscripts and the Q of

[15] P. 328–353.

[16] E. g. the classical passages—Nedarim 37b, Megillah 25b and Pesahim 50a. See also Norzi on the various passages, to which Talmudic references are extant. Also H. L. Strack: Prolegomena Critica. pp. 81–86, Geiger: Urschrift p. 254 ff., Weiss Dor Dor Ve-dorshav IV, 239, Buhl: op. cit. p. 100 ff., Aptowitzer: Das Schriftwort in der rabbinischen-Literatur, also the Hebrew Encyclopedia Ozar Yisrael IX, 227 f.

[17] Cf. I Macc. I:56–57; Josephus: Antiquities XII, 5, 4 for the destruction of the books of the Law by Antiochus.

[18] An extensive list of the upholders of the variation theory is given by S. Bamberger, Die Bedeutung des Qeri-Kethib (1930), p. 269.

[19] Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta p. 221. "Die Gewissenhaftigkeit der Masoreten liess sie alles in den Codd. sich Vorfindende aufnehmen."

the larger number. With slight variations, this is also the view of Buhl,[20] who maintains that the K offers older forms of the text in a large number of instances, and of Lambert,[21] who claims that the Qere is the form more in accord with usage or the context.

Not much later than the theory that the KQ are manuscript variations, is the view that the Q consists of corrections of erroneous readings in the text. The first defender of this hypothesis is none other than the august Abrabanel in the introduction to his Commentary on Jeremiah.[22] Why, he asks, is the Q uniformly reverenced if it is no more than a textual variation? Is it to be assumed that נער, עפולים, and such words, always suffered variation at the hands of scribes while others remained untouched? He preferred to explain the KQ as due to another cause. Ezra observed in the text various incongruities of language or context. These are due, either to a mysterious message that the sacred author sought to communicate, or to ignorance of grammar.[23] Ezra, however, dared not alter the sacred text, and so he wrote his explanation or correction on the margin as the Q. Abrabanel maintains that the large number of KQ in Jeremiah is due mainly to the fact that the prophet wrote in error or oversight.

It is evident that such a view would arouse a great deal of resentment,[24] since it ascribed errors to the Biblical authors. Nevertheless, it found many champions, especially among

[20] Op. cit. p. 99 f.

[21] Une série de Qere Kethib, p. 5.

[22] Reprinted by Jacob b. Hayyim in his Introduction and often requoted.

[23] אם להיות האומר אותם בלתי מדקדק כראוי אם בקיצור ידיעת דקדוק הכתיבה והיה זה מהנביא כשגגה היוצאת מלפני השליט.

[24] See especially Jacob b. Hayyim's Introduction, second folio, and Elias Levita: Masoreth HaMasoreth, Third preface.

Christians, such as Morinus,[25] Simon,[26] and Sixtinus Amama,[27] who in varying ways offered evidence in favor of this view.

Among the moderns this view was maintained in its purity by Strack[28] and Ginsburg.[29] In slightly varied form it was defended also by Wellhausen,[30] who, after excluding the euphemisms, claims that the KQ are corrections, based perhaps on some slight manuscript authority. As further evidence that these are no manuscript variations, he cites the fact that the KQ always consist of two readings, and never more. Though he places their origin in hoary antiquity, Wellhausen maintains that the KQ were first put into writing after the introduction of the vocalic system.

From the preceding discussion it has become plain that both theories, though not devoid of some justification, are open to grave objections, and therefore an eclectic theory was proposed,[31]

[25] Exercitationes Biblicae, Exer. XXIV chapter IV, p. 630.

[26] Hist. Crit. V. T. Book 1 chapter 23.

[27] Anti Barbar. Book I chapter 14.

[28] Op. cit. p. 82. Hi-loci . . . . . docent lectiones Kre nominatas originem non debere variae codicum scripturae.

[29] Op. cit. p. 183. Masoretes . . . . . who have decided that the marginal Keri is the correct one.

[30] Bleek: Einleitung in das alte Testament, 6th ed. 1893, p. 572 f.

[31] Interesting merely historically is the theory that the KQ variations are matters wherein mysteries lurk. This theory is favored by Nahmanides (Intr. to Comm. on Pent.), Ibn Adonijah (Intr. to Rabb. Bible), Levita (op. cit. third preface), and the unknown author of the Manuel du Lecteur ed. J. Derenbourg—1871 (pp. 51, 129 of the text). See also Krochmal: Moreh Nebuhe Hazeman chapter 13.

Among Christians this theory that esoteric meanings were concealed in the KQ was also very popular. Thus, Isa 9:6, upon which Jewish midrashic interpretation is plentiful, (cf. Kimhi and Norzi ad loc.) was also the subject of Christian homiletics, which, in various ways, found Mary's name concealed in the KQ there. Cf. Hiller's indignant remarks on this species of interpretation. (op. cit. p. 8, and references there). Bamberger's work is also a defense of the mystical character of the KQ variations.

notably, by Capellus.[32] The KQ variations were of several types: some Q were manuscript variants, others were euphemisms for coarser expressions in the text, while still others were corrections which the reverence of the Masoretes had limited merely to the margin. This theory had the advantage of escaping the various objections made against the individual theories, and in varying forms is the regnant one to-day.

Thus J. Derenbourg[33] virtually recapitulates Capellus' classification as does Levias[34] who divides them into the following classes:

1. Variations of ancient manuscripts.
2. Corrections replacing erroneous, difficult, irregular, provincial, archaic, unseemly, or cacaphonous expressions.
3. Mystic meanings.
4. Variants due to Talmudic literature.

The work of Rosenfeld[35] has the merit of being almost unique in dealing with the subject by studying not isolated cases of KQ, but larger segments. Nevertheless his study of the Pentateuchal variations was not inclusive enough to permit definite conclusions.

This is a brief history of the various views that have been propounded. We now turn to a consideration of the objections to which each of the theories is open.

[32] Critica Sacra book III ch. 15.

[33] In his edition of the Manuel du Lecteur. See note V., p. 229.

[34] Jewish Encyclopedia, s. v. Masorah.

[35] Ma'amar bikethib uQre, (Hebrew).

Chapter Two

THE PROPOSED THEORIES EXAMINED

That the *theory of manuscript variations* has difficulties to contend with, has already become evident in the history of the discussion on the KQ. It is now our task to enter into these objections more fully.

I. If it be assumed that manuscript variations lie at the basis of the KQ, the term Kethib-Qere offers considerable difficulty. Of two variations, it is difficult to see why one should be termed "the written" and the other "the read". Terms for "variation" like *nusha* and *girsa* are not foreign to Jewish literature. Why should this strange procedure be adopted of having one variant always written and the other always read? Nor can the problem be dismissed by a reference to "the caprice of the Masoretes". The Masoretic system may not coincide with ours, but it has a raison d'être which must be sought after and understood, not scouted and denied. Our question therefore remains. What explains the use of the term "Kethib-Qere" and the adoption of this unusual method for preserving manuscript variants?

II. Moreover, as has already been noticed by Abrabanel[1] and Levita,[2] if the Kethib and Qere are no more than manuscript variations, why is the Q obligatory upon the reader in the synagogue, and why is such persistent strictness maintained in the enforcement of this rule?[3] Upon what principle is one set of

[1] Op. cit.

[2] Loc. cit., 3rd preface.

[3] Maimonides, Mishneh Torah, Hilchoth Sepher Torah, chap. 7, par. 11; cf. Tur Yoreh Deah, Hilchoth Sepher Torah, sec. 275 par. 6, where a scroll in which the Q is incorporated in place of the K, is disqualified. Cf. Tur Orah

variants absolutely essential in the writing and forbidden in the reading and another set forbidden in the writing and obligatory in the reading? It would seem that in this rule of the Synagogue, there must be preserved some ancient memory as to the origin and nature of the KQ. What it was we shall attempt to ascertain later.

III. In addition, those who maintain the variant theory are at a loss to explain how the euphemistic KQ (List 2)[3a] are related to the main body. Thus Carpzov[4] insists that the euphemisms belong to the latest period of the KQ, when they were joined to the already existing corpus of variant readings. Let it be noticed, too, that these euphemistic renderings are by no means inconsiderable in number, if we include, as we properly should, the Tetragrammaton among them.[5] The variation theory must therefore separate a large and important body of KQ from the remainder, and leave the mutual relation of these groups undetermined.

IV. But even in the remaining groups, there are certain peculiarities that render the variation theory untenable. For example, there is a considerable number of variants where the Kethib has וֺ as the third person masculine suffix with plural masculine nouns and analogously formed prepositions (Lists 3a, 3b, 3c).[5a] In each of these 156 examples the Qere postulates

Hayyim, 141, par. 8, where the responsum of Solomon ben Adret as to the Sinaitic character of the KQ is referred to, and an incident related where a Reader in the synagogue who insisted on reading the K was removed from the platform through the agency of R. Isaac Aboab and other dignitaries. כל תיבה שהיא קרי וכתיב הלכה למשה מסיני שתהא נכתבה כמו שהיא בתורה ונקרית בענין אחר ומעשה באחד שקרא כמו שהיא כתובה בפני נדולי הדור ה"ר יצחק אבוהב וה"ר אברהם ואלאנסי ז"ל והתרו בו שיקרא כפי המסורה ולא רצה ונדוהו והורידוהו מהתיבה.

[3a] As e. g. Dt 28:30: יִשְׁכָּבֶנָּה ק', ישנלנה כ'.

[4] Op. cit. p. 340.

[5] See Chapter three.

[5a] As e. g. Ex 32:19: מִידֵיו ק', מידו כ'; I Sam 2:10: עָלָיו ק', עלו כ'.

יו. Yet in not one case is the reverse to be met with: that is that the Kethib should have the יו ending and the Qere the ו. There are also 52 examples of ה as the third person masculine singular suffix of nouns in the Kethib (List 4), where again the Qere uniformly reads the ו ending.[5b] Here too there is no example of the reverse. Were these KQ merely variants, we should expect both the plene and the defective, the Holem–He and the Holem–Vav forms in the Q, as is the case in the עֲנִיִּים – עֲנָוִים groups[6] (List 39), in such forms as חַלִּינוּ – חֲלוֹנוּ[7] (List 56) and in the שְׁבִית – שְׁבוּת forms[8] (List 40). We are therefore constrained to admit that these KQ groups of suffixed forms cannot be manuscript variations but are in some manner exceptions.[9] Once again the problem arises of the relation to the main body of this corpus of over 200 KQ, almost one sixth of the entire number, as it does in the case of the euphemisms.

V. Wellhausen's objection, mentioned above, is also very striking. If the KQ is merely a catalogue of variations on the part of the Masoretes, it may well be questioned why they are always two in number, never three or four, as one would expect from any extensive collation of manuscripts.

[5b] As e. g. Gen 9:21: אהלה כ', אָהֳלוֹ ק'.

[6] Isa 32:7: עֲנִיִּים ק'; Ps 9:13: עֲנָוִים ק'.

[7] Ex 16:2: וַיָּלִינוּ ק'; Ex 16:7: חֲלִינוּ ק'.

[8] Ps 126:4: שְׁבִיתֵנוּ ק'; Jb 42:10: שְׁבוּת ק'.

[9] There is another difference between Lists 39, 40, 56 and Lists 3a, b, c, and 4. In the former instances, not every similar example is a K and Q; thus עֲנָוִים and עֲנִיִּים both occur in the text without a Qere, as e. g. Ps 10:17, Isa 3:15 et al. This is also true of the idiom שוב שבות. In the preliminary remarks before each List, the reader will find that practically each category of KQ has exceptions, where there is no KQ variation. This is to be expected where we are dealing with bona-fide scribal variations. In Lists #3 and #4, however, *every* case is exhausted; that is, every example of ו in the text is noticed by the Q. This is therefore prime evidence that these are *not* variations.

VI. Moreover it is difficult to ascertain the grounds on which the Masorah decided that one reading was the K, while the other was the Q. It has been suggested, as noted above, that the K normally embodies the older reading; or that the Q is usually the more satisfactory one, in regard to context or style. These suggestions remain mere conjectures, without much plausibility, especially if all the material is used as the basis of judgment.

VII. Finally, we have positive evidence that at one time, at least, this pious registration of variants on the margin was not in vogue. In a statement preserved in Jer. Megillah IV, 2; Soferim 6:4, we read: R. Simeon b. Lakish said, "Three manuscripts were found in the Temple court: one contained the reading מעון (Deut 33:27) and two contained the reading מעונה; one had the reading זאטוטי (Ex 24:5), and two, the reading נערי; in one היא was found nine times, in two, eleven times. In each case the singular reading was suppressed and the reading of the two manuscripts was adopted." Though not devoid of difficulties, the passage which bears on it the stamp of antiquity,[9a] makes it plain that the procedure with manuscript variants was much more summary than the KQ arrangement, namely, the majority of codices established the text, and the minority reading disappeared completely. Thus on מְעוֹנָה (Deut 33:27) there is no Masoretic remark whatsoever.[10] Nor is it likely that these three passages were the only cases of variation in the Bible. It seems, rather, that here decision on other grounds was impossible, or

[9a] See Geiger's Urschrift p. 232 where a lengthy discussion of this important statement is given from another viewpoint. Geiger's view that this illustrates the carelessness with which the Biblical text was handled (see p. 231) is unwarranted. Their method, though perhaps not sufficiently refined, shows a high regard for textual matters, and an attempt at a critical procedure.

[10] See Ginsburg's edition ad loc.

that this tradition alone survives of an entire class.[11] What then prompted the change from this well attested method (of discarding the minority reading) to the KQ scheme, by which even the minority reading was jealously guarded as "a tradition of Moses from Sinai",[12] and was obligatory either in the writing or the reading?

It is evident that the theory that the KQ are merely manuscript variations has several difficulties to encounter. On turning to the rival theory of corrections, we find an even more overwhelming series of objections.

I. The prime objection to the assumption of so large a number of corrections on the part of the Masoretes, is that it is opposed to the spirit of the Masorah. In spite of the countless charges of "caprice" and "wilfulness" levelled against it, the fact remains that the Masorah was primarily and essentially a force for conservation. In the thousands of variants with which manuscripts were filled, the Masoretes saw a vast danger to the preservation and transmission of the Bible. They therefore set themselves the difficult task of fixing the text, of stemming the tide of variation, which the human factor was constantly introducing into the Word of God.

II. That those who "counted the letters of the Torah", who established the Vav of נָחוֹן (Lev 11:42) as the middle letter of the Pentateuch,[13] and the Yod of בַּיִר (Jer 6:7) as the middle letter of the Bible,[14] and whose knowledge and reverence for each jot and tittle of the text reached inconceivable heights—that these same men would engage in wholesale emendations,

[11] Thus Weiss supposes that there were special Baraithas which may have been gathered together, on Masoretic subjects. Dor Dor Ve Dorshav, vol. IV p. 240.

[12] See the Responsum of Solomon b. Adret on the margin of the Shulhan Aruch, and note 3 above.

[13] See Kiddushin 30a.

[14] See Ginsburg's larger edition, ad loc.

where these were nearly always unnecessary and often ill-advised —this is not merely paradoxical; it is unbelievable.

III. This a priori judgment we find vindicated for the Pentateuch by Rosenfeld's demonstration.[15] Of the eighty KQ he found in the five Books of Moses, only two, (יקרחה Lev 21:5 and מצותו Deut 5:9) were absolutely called for because of a faulty text. To assume that the main interest of the Masoretes was correction, and then to discover 2 out of 80 examples to substantiate this view is hardly convincing.

Rosenfeld's investigation was restricted to the Pentateuch. We are able to present more conclusive results based on our study of all the KQ of the Bible, the details of which are presented in the extensive Classification in the Appendix.

IV. In the following categories no correction can be contemplated, because what is Qere in one list is Kethib in the other and vice versa. Compare in detail Lists #26 and 27, 28 and 29, 34 and 35, 39 (within the group), 40 (within the group), 43 and 44, 45 and 47, 46 and 48, 50 and 51, 52 and 53, and 71 (within the group). We cull from these lists a few examples where the identical word is now K and now Q, and there can therefore be no question of correction.

בר' לט, 20 כ' אֲסוּרֵי ק' אֲסִירֵי	שו' טז, 21, 25 כ' הָאֲסִירִים ק' הָאֲסוּרִים		
במ' כו, 9 כ' קְרוּאֵי ק' קְרִיאֵי	במ' א, 16 כ' קְרִיאֵי ק' קְרוּאֵי		
אס' ח, 13 כ' עֲתוּדִים ק' עֲתִידִים	יש' י, 13 כ' עֲתִידוֹתֵיהֶם ק' עֲתוּדוֹתֵיהֶם		
יש' לב, 7 כ' עֲנָוִים ק' עֲנִיִּים	עמ' ח, 4 כ' עֲנִיִּים ק' עֲנָוִים		
צפ' ב, 7 כ' שְׁבוּתָם ק' שְׁבִיתָם	אי' מב, 10 כ' שְׁבִית ק' שְׁבוּת		
שמב' יד, 7 כ' שׁוּם ק' שִׂים	שמב' יג, 32 כ' שִׂימָה ק' שׁוּמָה		
שמ' טז, 2 כ' וַיְלִינוּ ק' וַיָּלִינוּ	שמ' טז, 7 כ' תְלוֹנוּ ק' תַלִּינוּ		
יה' כב, 7 כ' מֵעֲבָר ק' בְּעֲבָר	יה' כד, 15 כ' בְּעֲבָר ק' מֵעֲבָר		

[15] Ma'amar Bikethib Uqre; also J. Dérenbourg, Manuel du Lecteur, p. 229 note.

V. Besides these categories where K and Q reverse each other, practically *all* lists after number 9 can show similar cases unmarked by the Masorah as KQ.[16] Were it the intention of the Masorah to correct a given word, it is inconceivable how all the parallel usages could have remained uncorrected. For details we must refer the reader to the preliminary remarks and to the notes to the lists themselves. Nevertheless we select a few examples

[16] It cannot be assumed that the Masoretes did not complete their work and that therefore they left many cases uncorrected, for these reasons:

1. There are too many examples, for us to assume that they escaped notice. Thus List 17, contains twelve examples. Nevertheless, the identical case is left without a Qere seven times. In List 13, אַתְּ is "changed" five times by the Q, but is left uncorrected three times.

2. Moreover, one of the exceptions to List 17 is KQ to the Madinchae (1 Sa 4:15 ועיניו קמה) and hence cannot be due to a neglect to observe this passage.

3. Besides, very often in the same section, a word is marked KQ several times while several times the Q is in the text. In Ju 9, vv. 8 and 12 have a KQ on מלוכה and מלוכי, while v. 9 has מלכי without a KQ. Similarly, Neh chap. 3, vv. 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 29, have אחריו with no KQ. In v. 30, 31 the K אחרי is changed by the Q into אחריו. Here it cannot be maintained that in some passages the correction was forced into the text, while in others near at hand the correction remained on the margin.

4. Often the less obvious example has the KQ; while a more obvious one is left uncorrected. Thus the difficult verse Pr 15:14 has the K (ופני) and the Q (ופי), while in Nu 33:8 מפני החירות is left uncorrected though the preceding verse reads על פי החירות as in Ex 14:1, 9, (see Tar. Jerus., Baal Haturim, Ibn Ezra at Num. 33:8). So also the impossible יגאל in Ru 4:4 is left unchanged while ואדע in the same verse is modified by a Q. It cannot be oversight that leaves an important difficulty uncorrected and changes a perfectly possible form in the same verse.

5. When the Masorah so wishes, it corrects every case, like the euphemisms (List 2) or the examples in Lists 3 and 4. Hence oversight cannot be invoked.

6. Indeed, the Masoretic labors are extended over the entire text of the Bible in such minute detail as to render unlikely the omission of a matter as important as KQ variations. We believe that sufficient evidence has been adduced to prove that the KQ are not an *incomplete* list of corrections and emendations.

where a word is Kethib in one instance, while in another passage it is entirely unchanged, and is read as well as written:

בר' כד, 33	כ' ויישם	בר' נ, 26	וַיִּישָׂם
שמ' ב' ג, 25	כ' מבואך	תה' נ, 1	מְבוֹאוֹ
שמ' ב' יג, 33	כ' כי אם	בר' לב, 29	כִּי אִם יִשְׂרָאֵל
שמ' ב' כג, 20	כ' אריה	לרוב	אַרְיֵה
יר' ו, 7	כ' בור	לרוב	בּוֹר
יר' טז, 16	כ' דוגים	יח' מז, 10	דַּוָּגִים
יר' כח, 1	כ' בשנת	מל' ב' יז, 6	בְּשָׁנַת
אי' כא, 13	כ' יבלו	יש' סה, 22	יְבַלּוּ

Of particular importance to the upholders of the correction theory are the groups of archaisms, in our classification Lists #13 to 25. Here, it is maintained, the method of the Masoretes is most obvious. Instead of replacing the archaic forms in the text, they placed the later forms on the margin because of their reverence for the text. This view is however untenable. If we except Lists 23–25 which contain Aramaic forms and are susceptible of another interpretation, there are only two Lists, 20 and 22, totalling only eight cases, where we have been unable to find any exceptions unnoticed by the Masorah. In lists 16, 17 and 19, the exceptions "uncorrected" by the Masoretes are more numerous than the cases of KQ. In Lists 13 and 18, there are a substantial number of exceptions, while even Lists 15 and 21 are not devoid of parallels "uncorrected" by a Q. These groups of archaisms show, in addition, two striking examples: the Q changes שַׂמְתָּ (Ps 90:8) into שַׁתָּה, a less regular form, and the later form תְּהֹלָה of the K (Je 49:25) is converted into a more archaic (?) form by the Q. It is obvious, then, that the idea of removing archaisms, as such, was foreign to the Masoretes' mind. Why the major part of the archaisms are found in the K rather than in the Q, will become evident later.

VI. Besides, the Q offers several examples of hapax legomena or rare forms which it creates, often against a well-attested K. These are, of course, only a mere fraction of all the passages where the K is better than the Q.

בר' ח, 17	ק' הַיְצֵא	יר' מג, 10	ק' שַׁפְרִירוֹ
שו' ז, 13	ק' צְלִיל	יח' ד, 15	ק' צְפִיעֵי
שמא' כז, 8	ק' הַגְּזָרִי	יח' כז, 15	ק' וְהָבְנִים
שמב' ג, 25	ק' מוֹבָאָךְ	תה' קכט, 3	ק' לְמַעֲנֵיתָם
מלא' ו, 5	ק' יָצִיעַ	מש' כ, 20	ק' בָּאֶשׁוּן
יש' כג, 13	ק' בַּחוּנָיו	אי' ז, 5	ק' וְגוּשׁ
יר' ו, 7	ק' בֵּיר	שה' א, 17	ק' רָהִיטֵנוּ
יר' לז, 4	ק' הַכְּלוּא	קה' ה, 10	ק' רָאוּת
		נח' ז, 54	ק' בַּצְלִית

VII. But there is one more argument of still more sweeping import against the view that the Q is a correction of the K. If we omit 273 KQ (Lists 1 to 8 inclusive),[17] we have 1077 KQ variations, according to our enumeration. By a detailed study of these passages, the results of which will be found in the Lists and the accompanying notes, we have endeavored to ascertain which is the preferable reading. The results are best seen in the subjoined chart.

KQ VARIATIONS	NO.	%OF ENTIRE NO.
Q preferable to K	200	18.57%
K preferable to Q	133	12.34%
K as satisfactory as Q	715	66.38%
K and Q both unsatisfactory	29	2.69%
TOTAL	1077	99.98%

[17] The reason for the omission, as will be made plain later, is that we insist that both אחרו and אחריו are identical, that is they both equal אַחֲרָיו. The same holds for אהלה and אהלו etc.

In other words, the Q is superior to the K in only 200 cases, or 18% of the entire number in the Bible. This will hardly suffice to prove the correction theory, especially if we recall that the K is preferable to the Q is no less than 12%.

These are the two major objections to the correction theory: it is opposed to the meticulous reverence for the text characteristic of the Masoretes, and is not borne out by the nature of the KQ variations themselves. Moreover, certain other considerations must now be taken into account.

VIII. If any two copies of a given work be compared, one is sure to discover a number of variations between the two manuscripts. In any particular passage, one reading will be superior to the variant in the other copy. Nevertheless, its superiority over its rival does not prove that it is a correction of the other. There is a second possibility that must be reckoned with—the superior reading may be the result of a more accurate copy of the original. Thus, if two scribes, B and C, each make a copy of a given text, A, a certain number of variations will be found to exist between their two copies. Now, where the first scribe, B, copied correctly, his text will show a better reading than C's manuscript. Supposing the original A to be lost, and only copies B and C to be preserved, some scholarly reader, D, might collate the two versions and note the differences. Yet it would be faulty reasoning to infer that B's better reading is due to a *correction* of C's inferior text.[18]

[18] Of course, a better reading *may* be due to some individual reader's correction of a faulty text, but it is impossible to establish whether it is due to "following copy" more faithfully or to a conscious change in the text. We have purposely refrained from attempting the impossible task of gauging the psychologic process in some unknown scribe's mind, and dealt with these variations solely from the Masoretic standpoint. Though we grant that some of the "better" readings may have originated as corrections, we believe that the Masoretes, who incorporated them into our present Biblical text, found

To illustrate by a concrete example, the two passages in the Pentateuch where Rosenfeld found that the K stood in need of correction, need not be, and in the light of our evidence *are* not, corrections on the part of the Masoretes. In Leviticus 21:5 the K יקרחה is admittedly inferior to the Q יקרחו. Yet יקרחו is not necessarily a correction. It may be that where one manuscript, from which our K descends, erred, the other, from which our Q hails, made no such blunder. In other words, a superior reading is no proof of a correction, unless an intent to correct can be proved, such as a uniform practice throughout the text or some such cogent reason. Now, we are in a position to test this conclusion by a study of the parallel passages of the Bible.[19] In fact, this has already been done by Hiller,[20] who compares Jeremiah 52 and II Kings 25. Taking one text as the basis of the K, he prints the variations of the other as the Q. To show how much these variations resemble our KQ, we have selected several examples from these chapters and give analogous KQ forms near them. That these differences of the parallel passages are merely manuscript variants goes without saying. The fact that the KQ resemble them is an additional proof that they too are not corrections, but merely divergences of manuscripts.

Verse	*II Kings 25*	*Jeremiah 52*	*Kethib*	*Passage*	*Qere*
1.	בִּשְׁנַת	בַּשָּׁנָה	בִּשְׁנַת	יר' כח, 1	בַּשָּׁנָה
	וַיִּחַן	וַיַּחֲנוּ	וַיֹּאמְרוּ	יה' ו, 7	וַיֹּאמֶר
4.	וַיֵּלֶךְ	וַיֵּלְכוּ			

them as variations extant in manuscripts and regarded them in this light. Concerning the spirit of the Masorah something may be inferred with a fair degree of certainty; as to the motives of some unknown scribe, every guess is hazardous.

[19] Besides the commentaries on the various books, see R. Girdlestone: Deutographs (Oxford 1894) and F. Vogel: Die Konsonantischen Varianten in den Doppeltüberlieferten Poet. Stuecken (Leipzig 1905).

[20] Op. cit., Book II, chap. 10, p. 388, though he is not always exact.

Verse	*II Kings 25*	*Jeremiah 52*	*Kethib*	*Passage*	*Qere*
5.	אַחַר	אַחֲרֵי	מֵעַל	מלא' כ, 41	מֵעָלַי
6.	מִשְׁפָּט	מִשְׁפָּטִים	הַחֲצִי	שמא' כ, 38	הַחֲצֵים
7.	בָּבֶל	בָּבְלָה	הַגַּג	שמא' ט, 26	הַגְּגָה
11.	עַל	אֶל	עַל	שמא' כ, 24	אֶל

IX. It remains to notice one more argument against the theory that the KQ are corrections of the text—the Masoretic category of *Sebirin* or *Sebirin d'mat'en*. It is not within the province of our work to enter into a detailed discussion of this question.[21] We shall content ourselves with outlining the theory that seems most plausible.[22] Whenever the Masoretic text ex-

[21] The entire subject has been treated in an Erlangen dissertation by Julius Reach: Die Sebirin der Massoreten (Breslau 1895). Beside the literature there quoted we may add Ginsburg: op. cit. chap. 8, p. 187 ff., Ehrentreu: op. cit. p. 129.

[22] Reach finds three theories current regarding the Sebrin. 1) The view that the Sebirin are Masoretic warnings against emendations (see text) so Levita, the Buxtorfs, Frensdorf, Arnold (see op. cit. p. 10–13). This view, maintained by Prof. Margolis, we have adopted. 2) The view that the Sebirin are emendations on the part of the Masoretes, so Capellus, Eichorn, DeWette. 3) The theory that the Sebirin are older manuscript variants, so partially Geiger, Graetz, and Reach. The latter's arguments in favor of the third view are hardly convincing. 1) That some mss. mark as KQ what others mark as Sebir proves nothing except that different Masoretic schools may have differed among themselves, or, more probably, that one of these mss. is anti-Masoretic, that is, inexact. A reference to Ginsburg's larger edition of the Bible will show that in the case of practically every KQ some manuscripts adopt the Q in the text. Were we to follow Reach's reasoning in *this* case, a KQ would be equivalent to an ordinary text! 2) Reach's wholesale adoption of Ginsburg's list of Sebirin from his edition of the Masorah is positively misleading in view of the well-known uncritical nature of his compilation. In the KQ lists, Ginsburg includes *scores* of spurious KQ based on few and inaccurate manuscripts. It is therefore very probable that Ginsburg's list of Sebirin includes many spurious cases, and any discussion including them is ipso facto vitiated. 3) Reach has not attempted to show how often the Sebir is preferable to the text, and vice versa. If, as seems probable, the Sebir is nearly always preferable to the text, (Reach brings only a handful of excep-

hibited an anomaly in form or construction, upon which emendations were proposed, the Masoretes, concerned solely with the unaltered transmission of the textus receptus, would place the proposed reading in the margin with the note סביר or סביר׳ דמטעין, to warn the scribe against writing the proposed and easier reading in the text. For example, Ps 144:2 הָרַדְ עַמִּי תַּחְתָּי has on the margin סביר עמים, which is to be translated: Some think that עמים is the correct reading, but *it must not be written in the text,* because it is not in accordance with the Masorah. A synonym for סביר is *mat'en* or *sebirin d'mat'en* i. e. a proposed reading that leads people astray.[23]

Now, if the Masoretes, in their reverence for the text, took pains to warn against possible emendations, most of which have much in their favor, how likely is it that they would engage in wholesale emendation of the type of the KQ? More striking still, is the case of Ru 4:4, where the impossible יִגְאַל is left uncorrected[24] while the perfectly permissible K וְאֵדָע is changed by the Q into וְאֶדְעֶה.

We trust that enough material has been adduced to prove that corrections can play no part in accounting for the phenomenon of KQ.

tions, p. 22) it is unlikely that we have merely variants to deal with. 4) Reach gives a very forced explanation of the difference between Kethib-Qere and Sebir. He claims that the former are variants based on oral transmission, from the synagogal reading, while the latter are manuscriptal variants (p. 31). How is one to account for the KQ in those books of the Bible never read in the synagogue? Why should a Reader read כָּתִּים (Isa 23:12) when the text distinctly writes כִּתִּיִּים? Fuller discussion is here impossible, but enough has been brought to show that the Sebirin demand a fresh investigation and that the variant theory is untenable.

[23] In interpreting the latter phrase, it is better to treat the "proposed reading, Sebir" as the subject of the verb דמטעין, rather than assume as its subject either the redactors or the Masoretes, as Buxtorf and Capellus respectively assume. See Reach p. 19.

[24] See Delitzsch: Schreib-und-Lesefehler im A. Testament, par. 117.

It remains to notice the eclectic theory that postulates several distinct classes of KQ. In the first place, its assumption of corrections as one category, lays it open to all the objections that have been noted against the correction-hypothesis. Moreover, it suffers from most, though not all, the objections against the variation theory. (See arguments 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7.) There has never been set forth, also, the relation between the various classes as well as the history of their integration into one group. One may well say that though the eclectic theory is superficially easier, it is scarcely more satisfactory than its predecessors.

The theory recently maintained by Bamberger that the K and the Q are both divinely inspired and contain some mystic double meaning needs no lengthy refutation. It runs counter to the fundamental principles on which modern scientific research is based. The Talmudic dictum אין מקרא יוצא מידי פשוטו (Shab. 63a) "the literal meaning of the Biblical text is primary," applies to the KQ as well, especially since Bamberger admits that we do not know what mystic message is intended by the various KQ.

This mystical view seeks, of course, to uphold the traditional doctrine of the verbal inerrancy of Scripture. The Talmud itself assigns a reason for at least one category of KQ, the so-called obscene usages, but nowhere does it speak of a hidden reason for the KQ. Undoubtedly, the KQ were utilized for homiletic and mystical purposes, as was the Biblical text as a whole, but there is no ground for assuming that these variations owe their genesis to this cause.

With all due deference to the various views hitherto examined, it is obvious that a fresh and critical study of the entire problem is required. In the following chapters, such an investigation is made and a new theory concerning the nature and origin of the Kethib-Qere is proposed.

Chapter Three

THE ORIGINAL CLASSES OF KETHIB-QERE

In every department of inquiry, the nineteenth century substituted for the famous query of Ranke "Wie es eigentlich gewesen" the question "Wie es eigentlich geworden". What had previously been looked upon as fixed and immobile was now, upon closer inspection, made to yield up its secrets of growth and evolution. The application of this concept of development to the study of Jewish history and literature was a basic factor in the vast progress that the last hundred years have witnessed in this field.

The study of the Masorah, however, proceeded along the age-old lines, unperturbed by these new views. It is only in our own days, that the new spirit has been injected into this branch of inquiry, by such men as Kahle and his students. In his "Untersuchungen ueber die Masorah", a work inspired by Kahle, Ehrentreu succinctly summarizes the new attitude (p. 56):

"The development and the spirit of the Masorah will become more intelligible to us, the less we assume therein uniformity and rounded completeness." It is only in this spirit, we believe, that the KQ may be successfully understood. In this and the following chapters, we shall attempt to trace genetically the history of the KQ concept until it reached its final form.

The earliest attested example where a word in the Biblical text was not read and another was pronounced in its place, is the *Tetragrammaton*: יהוה. Whatever may be the reason,[1] a disin-

[1] Cf. Geiger: op. cit. p. 261 ff., Dalman: Der Gottesnamen Adonai, and Ehrlich: Randglossen zur hebraeischen Bibel, vol. I, p. 341–343 for conjectures on the subject.

clination toward pronouncing the "Divine Name" manifested itself at a very early period,[2] indirect evidence for which is to be found in the absence of its use in Ecclesiastes and Esther. This custom was common to the Diaspora no less than to Palestinian Jewry.[3] Thus the Septuagint on the Pentateuch, probably completed during the reign of Ptolemy II Philadelphus (285–247 B.C.)[4] translates the Tetragrammaton by *Kyrios*, following the Qere perpetuum on this word. "The Name" is expressly recognized as a KQ in Pesahim 50a:

אמר הקב"ה לא כשם שאני נכתב אני נקרא. נכתב אני ביו"ד ה"א ונקרא באל"ף דל"ת.

"Said the Holy One, Blessed be He: not as I am written, am I read: I am written Yod He (i. e. the Tetragrammaton), but I am read Aleph Daled (i.e. Adonai)."[4a] (See also the lines immediately preceding, in the text). Obviously, the Tetragrammaton forms a very numerous group of KQ, occurring as it does on almost every line of the Bible.

Another category which reaches back to hoary antiquity are the *euphemisms*. The locus classicus is Megillah 25a:

תנו רבנן כל המקראות הכתובים בתורה לגנאי קורין אותן לשבח.

"Passages written with unclean expressions, are changed to more seemly readings." (Then follow a few examples). That these euphemistic renderings are very ancient is proved by the fact that they display a fine and precise knowledge of Hebrew, down to the slightest shade of meaning. In these instances, the Q

[2] It must precede the Samaritan schism, since the Samaritans use שימא corresponding to the Jewish השם instead of the Tetragrammaton.

[3] Cf. Philo: de Vita Mosis III, 519, 529. Also Sanhedrin 10, I(90a) ואלו אין להן חלק לעולם הבא . . . אף ההוגה את השם באותיותיו.

[4] See Swete: Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek p. 18.

[4a] Where *Adonai* occurs with the Tetragrammaton, the latter is read (Qere) *Elohim*, as e. g. אדני יהוה Gen. 15:2, etc. See BDB s. v. אדני יהוה.

substitutes a less offensive term for the word in the text, where even modern scholars find it difficult to understand the distinction.[5]

In the case of the Tetragrammaton and the euphemisms, it is easy to understand how the terms Kethib and Qere originated. Where one word was written (Kethib) in the text, the Reader was commanded: "Read (Qere) so-and-so!" The Q was a direction to the Reader, to guard against blasphemy and obscenity, and the Reader who insisted on reading the K was therefore removed from his post.[6] The meaning of the term is entirely natural and unforced.

But the Q was a guard not only against sacrilegious and indecent reading: it was soon utilized as a protection against ignorance, or, more precisely, as a *means of fixing pronunciation before the invention of the vocalic system.* Here a digression is essential.

In all Semitic alphabets, no provision is made for writing the vowels in the text; only the consonants are written, while the vowels must be supplied by the reader. This mode of orthography[7] is, in the case of Hebrew and its dialects, most apparent in the Phoenician inscriptions, and is therefore called "Phoenician spelling", though it is characteristic of all varieties of early Hebrew. Thus on the Mesha[8] and Siloam Inscriptions,[9] we find

[5] Geiger (op. cit. p. 407–410) finds it difficult to make the reason for the changes plain. On שָׂגַל see also BDB: Lexicon, Feigin in AJSL October 1926 and references there. Also our notes to the examples in List 2.

[6] See Chapter 2, note 3.

[7] See Chwolson: Die Quiescentes הוי in der alt-hebraeischen Ortographie (3rd Inter. Congress Orientalists vol. 2 p. 459 ff., St. Petersburg 1876.); Bardowicz in MGWJ 1894, p. 117–121, 157–166.

[8] Smend and Socin: Die Inschrift des Koenigs Mesa Von Moab, text p. 12.

[9] See Delitzsch: Schreib- und Lesefehler im A. T. p. 17 note 1.

forms like שלשן, לכמש, הא, אש, קל, החצבם. This spelling meets us in the Bible, too, as e. g. מארת (Gen 1:14) הלכת (Ex 2:5) and עתדת (Deut 32:34). Indeed Lagarde maintains that the text that lay before the Septuagint was entirely without vowel letters.[10] This is hardly probable,[11] but there can be no doubt that at one time the Biblical text contained far fewer vowel letters than at present. This led to great uncertainty in the reading, since צדק, for example, could be read:

צָדָק, צְדֶק, צְדֹק, צְדָק, צְדָק, צָדַק, צַדֵק

The point of greatest danger was the end of a word, where the pronominal suffixes would find no expression in the written text,[12] though the danger elsewhere was scarcely less. So the semi-consonants Vav and Yod, as well as He, began to be used, at first sparingly and later in greater abundance.[13] When all or nearly all possible vowel letters are written, we have Mishnic spelling, as e. g. אסורים, as opposed to Mesha Inscrp. (l. 25) אסרן "prisoners". The Biblical spelling is midway between the Phoenician and the Mishnic modes. Though examples of both extremes of plene and defective spelling are plentiful in our Biblical text, normally vowel letters are used sparingly. Thus a word with two vowel-letters will have one written and the other unwritten.[14] For example, though בְּתֻלֹת (La 5:11) and

[10] Anmerkungen zu der Griech. Uebersetzung d. Prov. p. 4.

[11] That in many individual cases the Septuagint had no vowels or less than the M T, can be easily proved. E. g. Ps 72:5, M. T. reads יִירָאוּךָ and the LXX reads ויאריך. Other examples are plentiful.

[12] Mesha writes already בנחי, עשתי, יספתי, לפני, השעני; on the Siloam Inscription we read נקבה, רעו.

[13] Examples of missing, erroneously inserted, or confused vowel-letters have been collected by Delitzsch op. cit. par. 13–56, though with more zeal than caution.

[14] See Delitzsch op. cit. pp. 24, 25.

בְּחוּלוֹת (Isa. 23:4) both occur, the normal spelling would be בְּתָלוֹת (Zach 9:17) or בְּחוּלֹת.[15]

The insertion of vowel letters was never systematic or complete, but was left largely to the discretion of the scribes.[16] All varieties of spelling therefore occur in our present text of the Bible.

It is highly probable that if no force had been interposed, Biblical orthography would have been filled out to the proportions of the Mishnic, and vowel letters would have been written in every instance. But a force *was* interposed, that halted the levelling process. That force was the Masorah.[16a] It took the text as it found it, (the details will be made plain later) and fixed the spelling of each word by noting in each case חסר, מלא, חסר דחסר or מלא דמלא. From that time on, no Yod could be inserted into the text; a scribe who did so was creating a non-Masoretic codex. The textus receptus was now established. Precisely *when* the Masorah thus stepped upon the scene, it is difficult to say. It is likely that its efforts were crowned with success by the time of Hadrian. Rabbi Akiba could then speak of the Masorah as a fence about the Torah,[17] while the version of Aquila, which is in large measure due to him,[18] is the most reliable witness we possess

[15] This last form would not be preferred because of the possibility of confusion with בְּחוּלַת.

[16] See Jehuda Hayyug in Dukes und Ewald: Beitraege zur Geschichte und Spracherklaerung des A. T. vol. 3, p. 22 (Stuttgart 1844); Ibn Ezra in *Saphah Berurah* p. 7 (ed. Lippmann, Furth, 1839) who speak of the wilfulness of the scribes in this regard. These passages are quoted by Ginsburg: Introduction p. 135. Thus defectiva and plene readings constitute the main source of variants in the Kennicott and DeRossi collations.

[16a] The implications of this conclusion for the orthography of modern Hebrew are treated by the writer in two essays in *Leshonenu*, 5696, p. 202 ff.

[17] Cf. Aboth 3, 20, and Rashi, Bertinoro, Tifereth Yisrael ad loc. Other interpretations have been proposed, however, which refer the passage to halachic rather than textual matters, cf. Taylor, ad. loc., Swete, Introd. p. 434

[18] Cf. Kiddushin 59a, Jerome on Isa 8:14. See Swete: op. cit. p. 32 ff.

to the condition of the Akiban text. In all probability, the adoption of a standard codex, the archetype of all later manuscripts, falls roughly within the same period.[19]

It is true that further changes were now largely impossible; still, in the absence of vocalization, there were many opportunities for error in the reading.

It was only with the invention and perfection of the vocalic system that all possibilities of error were eliminated. The invention of vowel signs in Syriac and Arabic in the seventh and eighth centuries,[20] was slow and difficult. Its almost contemporaneous rise among the Jews was equally painful and uncertain, as has become plain through the researches of Pinsker, Graetz, Kahle, and other scholars.[21]

What has been insufficiently appreciated is the fact that between the time of the earliest Masorah and the first glimmerings of vocalization, there stretches a long and obscure period that may be termed the *pre-history of vocalization.* During this period other means were sought to safeguard the reading of the Sacred Text, and the chief agents in this task were the Masoretes. Thus Graetz[22] noticed that certain lists in the Ochla ve'Ochla were really guides, in the absence of vowels, to the pronunciation of words that were similar, but not identical, and hence liable to be mistaken for one another. Of this type are the lists that deal with *mil'el* and *milra'*, that is, similar words are termed *mil'el* if they have a heavier vowel, and *milra'* if they have a weaker vowel,

[19] Vide infra.

[20] Cf. Duval: Grammaire Syriaque, Intr.; Noeldeke: Geschichte des Korans p. 305 (1st edition).

[21] Pinsker: Einleitung in das assyrisch-babylonische Punktationsystem; Kahle: Der Masor. Text nach der Ueberlieferung der babylonischen Juden, Die Masoreten des Ostens; Die Masoreten des Westens; and his paragraphs on the Masorah in the introduction of Bauer-Leander, Historische Grammatik.

[22] Cf. MGWJ, Vol. 30, 1881, p. 340 ff.

e. g. holem against kames hatuph (אֱמֹר Ez 25:8; אֱמָר Pr 25:7), kames against patah (כָּאֲרָזִים Ca 5:15; כַּאֲרָזִים Nu 24:6), or a full vowel against the sheva, (וַיִצְבְּרוּ Ex 8:10; וְיִצְבְּרוּ Gen 41:35). Of this type are lists #5, 11, 26, 27, 28, 29, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, and 50 in Ochla ve'Ochla.

There are, however, other lists, previously unnoticed, which precede the vocalic system and are also designed to guide pronunciation in the absence of vowel signs. Such a list is no. 52, where Shin and Sin (called Samekh) are distinguished, as e. g.(Lev 2:14) נְרֶשׂ and (Deut. 33:14) נְרֶשׁ. Still another rubric antecedent to the invention of vowel signs is list 73:

א"ב מן חד וחד משמש אה' או' וכל חד ליח.

"an incomplete list of unique words where the first syllable has the vowel ֶ and the second syllable, the וֹ vowel". Since no vocalization is available, the Masoretes are compelled to use the awkward device of calling Kames the אה (aw) vowel, and Holem the או (ōw) vowel.

It is certain that these lists, like all Masoretic rubrics, were preceded by individual references at the various passages, and that only later were they formed into lists. It is our contention that the Kethib-Qere device was also utilized for the fixing of pronunciation before the invention of vowel signs, and that a large percentage of the KQ are therefore not manuscript variations, but *guides to the correct reading in the absence of vowels*. An illustration will make the matter clear. There are many cases where the third person masculine singular suffix is added to a plural noun, and written defective that is, יָדָו instead of יָדָיו. Here the noun could easily be mistaken for a singular. The fortieth chapter of Ezekiel contains אילו, אילמו, several times, where the plurals of the nouns are intended in each instance. Yet these forms could easily be misread as אֵילוֹ or אֵילָמוֹ. In Prov. 30:10,

אדנו might be taken for אֲדֹנוֹ, instead of the idiomatic plural אֲדֹנָיו. The same holds true of the prepositions which take the plural suffixes, as אחרו (II Sa 23:9), סביבתו (I Sa 26:5) or תחתו (II Sa 3:12), in which the ending could be misread as a holem Vav. There are, moreover, a few nouns ending in consonantal Vav, like ענו (Nu 12:3), שלו (Nu. 11:32) and סחו (Ca 2:11), which were also liable to be mistaken for עָנוֹ or עָנֹו etc., especially since they are uncommon. Were vowel signs available, these potential errors could easily have been averted; in their absence, the Masoretes used the best means at their disposal for guarding the consonantal character of the Vav:— They wrote the plene spelling (with Yod), on the margin with ק' after it.[23] For example, by the side of תחתו in the text, they noted on the margin תחתיו ק' i. e. "Read *tachtav*!"[24] These instances constitute Lists 2a, b, c, in our Classification.

Similarly, the older masculine ending ה֑, found sporadically in the text, could be mistaken for the feminine ending ה֫ in the absence of vocalization, and here, too, the Masoretes marked on the margin עירו ק', i. e. "read with Holem", likewise as a guide to the reading.[25] (List #4).

The same explanation also holds for list #5, where the textual לא is to be read לו, i. e. it is to be vocalized לֹא.

The various arguments against assuming that these Q are variations of the K have already been set forth in Chapter Two. The

[23] Exactly as in OVO, List #73, where Kames is denoted by אה, and Holem by או.

[24] That in the case of ענו, the Q was merely to ensure the reading with consonantal Vav, is already recognized by Dillmann on Nu 12:3, and Koenig (Lehrgebaude II, 1, 76).

[25] The Samaritan Pentateuch, as is well known, changed each form into Holem Vav, a procedure against which the Rabbis had already protested in another connection (cf. Sifre to Deut 11:30). See Von Gall's edition at the various passages and Ch. Heller: The Samaritan Pentateuch an Adaptation of the Masoretic Text, p. 190–2.

exhaustiveness with which each example is noticed on the margin, the large number of cases where a singular or a feminine suffix, respectively, is impossible,[26] and the fact that never do we find the defective form on the margin, or the plene form in the text, combine with the evidence of Masoretic usage we have adduced from the Ochlah v'Ochlah to prove that we are dealing not with corrections or variants but with matres lectionis—guides to the reader.

But there is another piece of evidence to prove that the term *Kethib-Qere* was often meant by the Masoretes as mere guides to the reading. This proof is the indubitable usage of the Masoretes themselves. In Ochlah v'Ochlah, list 103, we read: מח' מלין נסבין א' במצעא חיבותן ולא קרין "48 words that take an Aleph in the middle that is not read," of which (Ex 5:7) תאסיפון is an example. Here נסבין is a synonym for כתבין, as is proved by the following list #104: י"ב מלין דכתבין א' בסוף חיבותן ולא קרין "12 words with an Aleph written at the end, that is not read," (an example of which is רָצוֹא Nu 13:9). Especially noteworthy is list #191: י"ח מלין כתבין ש' וקרין ס' "18 words written Shin and read with Samekh," which catalogues words with Sin, as for example, וְשַׂכְתִּי (Ex 33:22). In the absence of vocalization, this is the only way to prevent the reading with Shin, — yet this guide to the pronunciation is expressed by the regular Kethib-Qere terminology!

Whereas lists #1–2 are guides against blasphemy or obscenity, Lists #3–5 are guides against the Reader's ignorance. Yet both categories are genuine Kethib-Qere; though one word is *written* in the text, the Q admonishes "read thus!"

These groups contain 226 examples all in all, or 20% of the entire number. Regarding these, there can be no doubt that no

[26] As, e. g. I Sa 23:5 ואנשו (the singular would be ואישו); Jb 39:30 ואפרחו (plural verb יעלעו); II Sa 1:11 בבגדו (cf. ויקרעם); Deut. 33:9 בנו (parallel to אחיו). See notes to list 3 for further examples and details.

textual variations are intended. We now come to another category, where it is also probable that no variants exist, but here the evidence is not so conclusive (List #6). Twice we find the spelling גיים in the K, with the normal גוים as the Q, and several times צביים occurs with two Yods. Though the KQ may mark variations in spelling צְבִיִים by the side of צְבוִים etc., it is more likely that the Q is merely an admonition to read צְבוִים and גוִים with Holem, rather than צְבִיִים and גִיִים with Hirek. Here either explanation is possible.

Another category, where absolute certainty cannot be had, must now be discussed, (Lists #7–8). It was noted above that vowel letters were supplied with the greatest readiness at the end of words—because of the greater likelihood of error there. Now, there are a number of instances, where the K omits one of the letters Aleph, He, Vav, Yod, at the end of a word, either where there would be two identical vowel-letters adjoining each other, as e. g. (II Sa 5:2) K והמבי את; Q וְהַמֵּבִיא אֶת (List #7), or where only *one* occurs, as (1 Ki 21:29) K אבי; Q אָבִיא (List #8). In all these cases the Masorah has interrupted the process before the vowel letters were added to the text. We know that they were used sparingly, and that Biblical orthography prefers to write one of two possible vowel letters and not both. It is therefore possible that the vowel letters are omitted in these instances, not through error, but because of a conscious desire to minimize the number of vowel-letters. Be this as it may, the Q may be interpreted in one of two ways, either as a variation culled from manuscripts in which the vowel letters had already been inserted in the text, or, more probably, as guides to the reader to read and understand מביא as the Hiphil participle of בוא and to construe ישתחו as a plural, etc.

[27] See Chapter Two, note 3.

We prefer to regard these Q as guides to the reader, rather than as corrections or variations, for the following reasons. There are innumerable cases of vowel letters omitted, where no KQ occurs, as e. g. (Nu 11:11) מְצָאתִי or (II Sa 22:40) וַתְּזַרְנִי, which are either noticed by the Masorah merely as חסר or altogether passed over in silence. Hence, our KQ cannot be due to corrections. On the other hand, all cases without exception of vowel letters missing at the end of words are remarked upon by the Q. Therefore they cannot be manuscript variations. It therefore seems most plausible to assume that the Q in these instances is a guide to the correct reading and falls in with the preceding categories.

If we include these last-mentioned doubtful cases, and they are few in number, we discover that fully 273 or over 20% of the entire number may be termed the *original KQ*, that is, they are *guides to the Reader*, against reading obscene expressions in the synagogue, or against erring through ignorance. Moreover, if we add, as we properly should, the 6823 instances where the Tetragrammaton is replaced either by אדני or by אלהים, the total number of KQ mounts up to 8173, and the guides to the Reader, totalling 7096 examples, constitute no less than 87% of the entire number.

In all these cases, the Q is undoubtedly right, not because it is a correction, or a better variant, but because it is a direction as to the reading of the K. It was on the basis of these original classes of KQ, that the custom, and eventually the law, grew up, of reading only the Q, while the K remained inviolate in the written text. Later, when other groups of KQ were assimilated, they, too, were subsumed under the rules governing the original categories. Therefore the Q has remained universally obligatory upon the Reader in the Synagogue to this day, a mute and hitherto unheeded clue to the genesis of the KQ.

Chapter Four

THE LATER GROUPS OF KQ.

Thus far, the role of the KQ, in its capacity of guide to the reader, has been perfectly obvious and consistent. This function, however, tends to fall into desuetude with the invention of the vocalic system. But the KQ apparatus is again found useful, in a radical and far-reaching extension of its original use. It now becomes a means of preserving *manuscript variants*, and this to so large an extent, that its origin is all but obscured. This new use of the KQ comes as the culmination of a long series of attempts to deal with the problem of variations in the Biblical text. These attempts must now engage our attention.

Geiger speaks of a "Mangel an kritischer Sorgfalt"[1] as characteristic of the period ending at the second century of C.E. He seeks to prove that up to that time, the text was very carelessly handled, without any recourse to the canons of criticism. But this view is misleading. It would be unfair to expect modern methods of textual criticism operative in that early period, but we *do* find certain critical principles at work, constantly growing in refinement and precision.

We have already had occasion to refer to the Talmudic passage quoted in Jer. Megillah IV, 2, Soferim 6:4, regarding the three Bible codices found in the Temple, in which variations were noticed. We are told that in each case the majority reading was adopted, and the minority reading, discarded. It is important to understand what is here meant by "adopting". It can only

[1] Op. cit. p. 231: Die alte Zeit etwa bis gegen das zweite Jahrhundert n. Chr.—den Bibeltext auf Einzelheiten mit sehr geringer Sorgfalt behandelte.

mean that the sanctioned reading was entered into correct manuscripts,[2] while the suppressed reading may very well have lingered on in ordinary current texts, that could make no claim to accuracy. Nevertheless, from the Masoretic standpoint only the majority reading existed henceforth. The earliest stage, then, in the treatment of variations was the rather crude procedure of accepting the reading vouched for by the larger number of manuscripts, and consigning the minority reading to oblivion.

This method could not remain satisfactory indefinitely. It cannot have escaped notice that more original readings might be lost, if it was merely a question of "counting heads". The next step in the treatment of variants, we venture to suggest, was the method of conflation. Whenever two variants contested a given passage, an attempt was made by the Masoretes to embody them both in the text, if possible.[3] This practice, it is true, often created an anomalous form or a difficult construction, but it had the merit of preserving readings that would otherwise have perished. The Scribes of this early period must have felt that אלו ואלו דברי אלהים חיים, both readings were "the Word of the Living God", and hence worthy of preservation.

With no pretense to completeness or finality, we bring together the following examples of conflation as well as the readings that lie at their base:

שמ' ו, 4 את ארץ כנען את ארץ מגוריהם אשר גרו בה

א. את ארץ כנען את ארץ מגוריהם

ב. את ארץ כנען אשר גרו בה

[2] That the distinction between an accurate and an inaccurate codex was already felt before the destruction of the Temple, is proved by the passage in B. Kethubboth 106a: מגיהי ספרים בירושלים היו נוטלין שכרן מתרומת הלשכה "The official revisers of Biblical manuscripts were paid from the income of the Temple."

[3] Thus the likeliest explanation of such hybrid forms as הָתְפָּקְדוּ is that they are a combination of the Hophal and the Hithpael forms.

שמ' טז, 35 ובני ישראל אכלו את המן ארבעים שנה עד בואם אל ארץ נושבת את המן אכלו עד באם אל קצה ארץ כנען

א. ובני ישראל אכלו . . . ארץ נושבת

ב. את המן אכלו [בני ישראל] עד באם אל קצה ארץ כנען

וי' כ, 10 ואיש אשר ינאף את אשת איש אשר ינאף את אשת רעהו

א. ואיש אשר ינאף את אשת איש

ב. ואיש אשר ינאף את אשת רעהו

יה' ב, 7 והשער סגרו אחרי כאשר יצאו הרדפים[4]

א. והשער סגרו אחרי אשר יצאו הרדפים

ב. והשער סגרו כאשר יצאו הרודפים

יה' יח, 19 והיו (כ') תוצאותיו הגבול[5]

א. והיו תוצאותיו . . .

ב. והיו תוצאות הגבול

שמב' טו, 8 אם ישיב (כ') ישיבני ד' ירושלים[6]

א. אם ישיב [אותי] ד' ירושלים

ב. אם ישיבני ד' ירושלים

שמב' יט, 32 לשלחו את (כ') בירדן

א. לשלחו בירדן

ב. לשלחו את הירדן

יר' ב, 11 ההימיר גוי אלהיו[7]

א. הֲהֵמִיר גוי אלהיו

ב. הֲיָמִיר גוי אלהיו

[4] So, practically, Ehrlich, ad locum.

[5] Ehrlich, ad loc. maintains that הגבול was added erroneously to the original תוצאותיו. But why should this word be added to corrupt a perfectly intelligible verse? By our explanation, it becomes clear how this form came to be—as a conflate.

[6] Here the K may very well be due to ordinary dittography. The Q is impossible. It seems that the text is not in perfect order, and restoration is difficult with the means at our disposal.

[7] The perfect is an appeal to the experience of the world: "Has any people ever changed, etc?" The imperfect asks: "Is it possible that a people should change, etc?" See Driver: Hebrew Tenses (Third Ed.) par. 12, 33b.

יח' ג' 15 ואבוא אל הגולה תל אביב הישבים אל־נהר־כבר (כ')
ואשר המה יושבים שם[8]
א. ואבוא אל הגולה תל אביב הישבים אל־נהר־כבר
ב. ואבוא אל הגולה אשר המה ישבים שם
יח' ט, 8 ויהי כהכותם ונאשאר אני
א. ויהי כהכותם וָאֶשָּׁאֵר אָנִי
ב. ויהי כהכותם וְנִשְׁאָר אָנִי
אי' ה' 18 על הר ציון (כ') שהשמם[9]
א. על הר ציון שָׁשָׁמֵם
ב. על הר ציון הַשָּׁמֵם
קה' ו, 10 עם (כ') שהתקיף ממנו
א. עם שֶׁתַּקִּיף מִמֶּנּוּ
ב. עם הַתַּקִּיף ממנו
אס' ט, 19 על כן היהודים (כ') הפרוזים הישבים בערי הפרזות[10]
א. על כן היהודים הפרוזים
ב. על כן היהודים הישבים בערי הפרזות

Yet this method of conflation suffered from serious disadvantages. It created difficult and impossible texts, in which the confusion was usually far more noticeable than the preservation of the variants. In addition, it had an even more serious drawback —its inadequacy. Very few divergences were susceptible to conflation; the vast majority could not be treated in this fashion at all. It is for this reason that conflation finds no recognition in Rabbinic or Masoretic tradition. Its period of activity must have been short-lived and its influence upon the history of the text relatively slight.

[8] See List 80.

[9] The ordinary editions read שָׁשָׁמֵם with no KQ; we follow the editions of both Baer and Ginsburg.

[10] See notes on this passage, list #42. פרוז is one residing in an open place. See Megillah 19a: פרוז בן יומו נקרא פרוז. The Q is an inferior reading.

Various other means of treating variants were tried, such as the use of dots over words whose authenticity was doubtful.[11] That this usage belongs to the earliest period, is proved by the tradition's being dated back to Ezra.[12] It is important to remember, however, that throughout all these moves, one improvement in technique is making itself felt. Whereas the original practice was the total disregard of the minority reading, the advantage of the other schemes lay in their preserving the divergences.

But the Masoretes were still faced with seemingly insuperable problems in their attempts to safeguard the sacred text from variation. When each scribe was rapidly multiplying codices, one or even several correct texts were but a drop in the ocean. Each manuscript was not only heir to the errors of its ancestors, but was sinning against accuracy on its own account as well. The mere patching and revising of passages would never do; one scribe could add more variants than a generation of Masoretes would avail to correct.

Hundreds of years later, Islam faced the same situation. The solution was summary. One highly accurate copy of the Koran was adopted as the textus receptus and only lithographic copies of this manuscript were permitted in the mosques.[13] This procedure the Masoretes anticipated—without the lithographs, of course. They decided upon a standard codex by which others

[11] The literature on the dotted words is very large. The discussion of L. Blau: Masoretische Untersuchungen, recapitulated by C. D. Ginsburg in his Introduction, is basic.

[12] Aboth de Rabbi Nathan: (Chap. 34) כך אמר עזרא אם יבא אליה ויאמר לי מפני מה כתבת כך אומר אני כבר נקדתי עליהם ואם יאמר לי יפה כתבת אעביר הנקודה מעליהם. The Tikkune Sopherim are also often ascribed to Ezra, see Ochlah v'Ochlah, no. 168: י"ח מלין תקן עזרא.

[13] For this information I am indebted to Prof. S. L. Skoss, of Dropsie College who found this to be the uniform practice in the Orient, during his studies there.

might be revised[14] and which would serve as the archetype of all future manuscripts.[15] Historical conditions favored its acceptance. After the destruction of the Temple and the loss of political independence, Pharisaism became the only form of Judaism, and its archetype succeeded in becoming the textus receptus. The slightest peculiarities of this text, such as majuscules and minuscules, suspended letters and dotted words,[16] were transmitted with reverential care and fidelity, exactly as they occurred in this standard codex.

Two questions now press for an answer. When and on what basis was the archetype selected? On the former question, opinion is practically unanimous. Scholars are agreed that the standard manuscript was adopted in the time of R. Akiba (circa 100 C.E.) when the new interpretational principles of which he was the leading exponent came into play. Now, when every particle and prefix, plene and defectiva, was of potential importance as the source of new Halakah,[17] a great impetus was given to a correct and fixed text, and the result was the adoption of a standard codex.

[14] Cf. Jer. Sanhedrin II, 20: הגיה מן. Dillmann in Herzog's Real-Enzyklopedie II p. 388; Buhl: op. cit. p. 256.

[15] The existence of one archetype was maintained by Rosenmueller 1834 (Vorrede zur Stereotypausgabe des A. T.), A. Olshausen, 1853 (Psalmen, p. 17 f., 337 f.), Lagarde: Anmerkungen zur griech. Uebersetzung der Prov. p. 1 f., Noeldeke: Alt-Testamentliche Literatur p. 241 and Buhl p. 256. It is now almost universally accepted. The opposing view of Kahle does not account for the high degree of uniformity in extant Bible manuscripts.

[16] Cf. Buhl op. cit. p. 206.

[17] One example of many is Sanhedrin 4b, where the plene and defectiva spelling is appealed to: לטטפת לטטפת הרי כאן ארבע דברי רבי ישמעאל ורבי עקיבא אומר אינו צריך . . .

On this use of plene, defectiva and particles, see Frankel: Darche Ha-Mishnah p. 120, note 1: בחפשו הרבה במקרא על חסרות ויתרות בדרשות ווין ומלות כפולות.

On the latter question, scholars are not so united. Some have maintained that the choice of the archetype was based on mere arbitrariness or chance, but this view has rightly been contested.[18] The Masoretes at this time were sufficiently critical to choose a text of known antiquity and general reliability. This conclusion, we shall find, derives a great deal of support from considerations to be adduced later.

In spite of the consensus of scholarly opinion, we feel that the date set for the adoption of the archetype is too late. Even if we grant that these precise methods of interpretation were the spur to the choice of a standard manuscript, we shall be compelled to assign an earlier date. R. Akiba was not the creator of this method of Halachic interpretation; he was its greatest exponent. Nahum of Gimzo, under whom R. Akiba had studied[19] had already made use of "amplification and restriction" (רבוי ומעוט). Another Rabbi of the generation preceding Akiba had made wide and extensive use of particles like את in the Pentateuch[20]. By the time of Akiba and Ishmael, these methods were the common property of all the schools.

We are therefore constrained to go back at least a full generation before Akiba for this archetype. But it is highly unlikely that in the space of one generation, one manuscript among many should have been singled out, and subtle Halakic distinctions be based upon its minutest characteristics, without any mention being made of other extant codices. It is, moreover, difficult to

[18] Buhl p. 257.

[19] Cf. Shebuoth 26a: רבי עקיבא ששימש נחום איש גמזו שהיה דורש את כל התורה כולה בריבה ומיעט.

[20] Cf. Kiddushin 57a, Pesahim 22b: שמעון העמסוני ואמרי ליה נחמיה העמסוני היה דורש כל אתין שבתורה. כיון שהגיע לאת ה' אלהיך תירא פירש אמרו לו תלמידיו כל אתין שדרשת מה תהא עליהם אמר להם כשם שקבלתי שכר על הדרישה כך קבלתי על הפרישה עד שבא רבי עקיבא ולימד את ה' אלהיך תירא לרבות תלמידי חכמים.

believe that such an important step as the choice of an archetype could have occurred in a generation as prominent as that of R. Akiba and R. Ishmael without a notice of the event in the Talmud.

For all these reasons, it is far more likely that the archetype had been chosen long before Akiba, and that he and his predecessors already found it installed as the textus receptus, and therefore available as a basis for their hermeneutics. In line with the best traditions of the Masorah, the archetype had been chosen quietly and unobtrusively, probably before the destruction of the Temple, perhaps by those very "revisers of the scrolls" who are mentioned in the Talmud as receiving their income from the Temple treasury. Rather than the reverse, we prefer to believe that this exact and unvarying text offered the stimulus to the painfully precise hermeneutics, which the later generations of Tannaim favored in increasing measure.

Having established the destruction of the Temple (70 C.E.) as the terminus ad quem for the adoption of this archetype, we are now in a position to reconstruct other phases of its history. It is certain that great care was exercised in its choice, as regards its antiquity and trustworthiness. Nevertheless, these early Masoretes must have been fully aware that even inferior manuscripts might contain superior or older readings at given passages.[21] In addition to the archetype, there doubtless were other manuscripts of high repute in the Temple library which the official revisers must have used. For these reasons the mere adoption of an archetype could not have sufficed the custodians of the text. We believe that they must have collated the standard codex with others that were held in high esteem. On the margin

[21] Their procedure with the three Temple codices makes it plain that no single manuscript had all the readings that were finally adopted, but that the final text was based on all three.

of the archetypal manuscript, they marked those readings of the other codices that seemed preferable, or interesting, or at least equally satisfactory,—and it is evident that their latitude must have been very wide, in their desire to preserve everything of value. *Thus our written text, including the Kethib, is substantially the text of the archetype, while the Q is a selection of worth-while readings from the other non-archetypal manuscripts.* These variants, we believe, make up the bulk of the KQ variations as we know them today[22] (Lists #9–84). As a study of these will make plain, they are of all types, orthographical, morphologic, and rhetorical, but they all have one characteristic in common,—they are all *manuscript divergences, due to this earliest of collations.*

There is a highly interesting inference to support the conclusion that the KQ goes back to this archetype. In Chapter VI, the nature of the "spurious" KQ, i. e. those variants that are purely individual aberrations, is discussed. It is pointed out that practically all manuscripts and Masoretic authorities are unanimous in accepting the genuine KQ in toto, and in rejecting the spurious examples. It seems fair to conclude that the universal acceptance of the genuine corpus of KQ is on a par with the equally general adherence to the majuscules and minuscules, the dotted words, and other features of the archetypal codex, and goes back to the same source.

The archetype itself, as we have seen above, had previously been subjected to a great deal of conflation, which was, however, forgotten. When it was collated with manuscripts that bore only

[22] Noeldeke (ZDMG, 32, p. 591) who, in common with other scholars, assumes the Akiban period as the time for the adoption of the archetype, is forced to assume that the archetype already possessed the KQ on the margin. But this is merely leaving unanswered the question of their origin. On this view, no suitable occasion for the introduction of the KQ can be found, and if no more than an ordinary collation of manuscripts is meant, Wellhausen's objection as to the uniformly dual nature of the KQ retains its force.

a single, non-conflate reading, the standard codex showed a discrepancy. Hence we often find as the Q an original, non-conflate text, while the K (the archetypal reading) has the conflate.[23] In other instances, the awkward conflate text has been further changed in the direction of harmonization or ill-advised correction and these have come down to us as Q likewise, i. e. non-archetypal readings.[24]

If we thus understand the history of the standard codex, many perplexing questions raised by the KQ become plain. It was stressed that in the overwhelming majority of instances, the K bears the more archaic form (Lists # 12 ff.). This is what we expect, since the archetype was a manuscript of great age and conservatism.

That this collation should always have yielded two, and never more, variants, is also intelligible to us now, for we have, on the one hand, the archetype (K), and, ranged on the other, several non-archetypal codices, A, B, C, etc., all contributing their best readings to the Q. Yet the number of manuscripts utilized in the collation was not large, and hence variations were never more than two. Likewise the fluctuations of certain words such as שבות and שבית, ענוים and עניים, now as K and now as Q, become clear, as due to the divergences of the codices.

The large percentage of cases where the Q is preferable to the K (18%), and where the Q is as satisfactory as the K (66%), is also natural. Where the archetype was markedly superior, the divergences of other manuscripts were passed over in silence. Only when they possessed some value or interest, were they preserved on the margin.

[23] So Josh 18:19, II Sa 19:32, La 5:18, Ecc 6:10. See above.

[24] II Sam 15:8, Ez 3:15, Esth 9:19. See above.

[25] See Chap. 2.

Moreover, this hypothesis alone appears to explain the reaction of the Septuagint to the KQ satisfactorily. The entire problem is discussed at length in chapter V. Here it is sufficient to refer to the main conclusion. The rendering of the Qarian by the Greek translators in so many instances, points to their existence in one form or another before 250 B.C.E. To assume their existence as marginal variants at so early a date seems highly improbable, for that would mean a highly developed state of Masoretic activity. We are therefore constrained to imagine them as actual readings in manuscripts. This view of the matter is strikingly confirmed by a number of cases where the Septuagint *misread* the Q![26] The versions thus offer evidence that at one time the Q existed as textual readings.

Long before the redaction of the Mishnah, this corpus of variants was complete. Indeed R. Joshua b. Hyrcanus seems to make use of a KQ variation in Job (Sotah 5, 5):

בו ביום דרש רבי יהושע בן הורקנוס לא עבד איוב את הקב"ה אלא מאהבה שנאמר הן יקטלני לו איחל ועדיין הדבר שקול לו אני מצפה או איני מצפה ת"ל עד אנוע לא אסיר תומתי ממני מלמד שמאהבה עשה אמר רבי יהושע מי יגלה עפר מעיניך רבן יוחנן בן זכאי שהיית דורש כל ימיך שלא עבד איוב את המקום אלא מיראה שנאמר איש תם וישר ירא אלהים וסר מרע והלוא יהושע תלמיד תלמידך למד שמאהבה עשה.

On that day R. Joshua b. Hyrcanus expounded: Job served God from love, for it is written, "Though he slay me, yet will I trust in Him." (Jb 13:15) Still the matter is undecided — "do I trust in Him" (לו) or "I do not trust" (לא). Another verse teaches that he served from love (Job 27:5) "Until I depart I shall not allow my integrity to be taken from me." Said R. Joshua, "Who will remove the dust from your eyes, O Rabban Johanan b. Zakkai, for all your days you expounded that Job served the Lord only

[26] See Chap. 5 for examples, especially the telling instance of Josh 3:16.

from fear as it said, "Perfect and upright, fearing God and eschewing evil." (Job 1:1) But now Joshua (b. Hyrcanus) your pupil's pupil, teaches that he served from love."

Here the Mishnah is unable to decide between לא and לו, apparently because both occur in the passage, the first as a K and the second as a Q.[27]

Biblical verses in which KQ occur, are quoted elsewhere in our editions of the Mishnah as well, either according to the Qere (Sotah 7:6; Hullin 11:2; Tamid 7:2; Middoth 3:1; 4:4; Yad. 4:4), or according to the Kethib (Sotah 9:6; Bech. 1:7). However, as Professor Ginzberg has pointed out, these readings vary in the different printed texts and in the Dikduke Sopherim of Rabbinovicz according to the predilections of later scribes. Tannaitic citations can be invoked as evidence for the KQ reading, only where the discussion revolves about the variation, as e. g. Pes. 119a; Meg.3b, 5b. It is also of interest that the Schools of Hillel and Shammai take cognizance of the traditional reading of the text, (יש אם למקרא) as distinct from the merely written form (Sanh. 4a and elsewhere).

These instances by no means exhaust the Talmudic testimony to the existence of the KQ. Of the entire body of variations that

[27] In the Gemara on this passage, Sotah 31a, the question is asked: "Let us see whether *Lo* is written with an Aleph or a Vav." This would imply that the Gemara knew of no KQ on this passage, or of what avail would a reference to the spelling be, if both were present. It is possible that this particular KQ, at least, had not yet penetrated into Babylonia. This is practically the view of Frankel: Vorstudien zur Septuaginta p. 31. It is however possible that the Gemara was asking as to the spelling of the Kethib, without regarding the existence of the Qere, as it seems to do with the Kethib of Isa. 63:9: בכל צרתם לא צר, in the following lines of the discussion. Professor Ginzberg, however, points out that the Talmud is to be understood on the basis of Kid. 30a to mean that the Babylonians did not consider themselves authorities on plene and defectiva, and other Masoretic matters, and the Tannaim ought to have known by consulting the text!

this ancient collation had brought to light, the most striking were the *Karian vela Kethiban*, that is, where the word did not occur in the archetype, but did, in the other manuscripts, and the *Kethiban vela Karian*, where the archetypal reading was lacking in the other reputable codices. These two groups are therefore mentioned, by name, together with other Masoretic termini technici, in the Talmud.[28] The KQ as a group are not noticed in Talmudic literature, as they were merely individual variants marked at the several passages affected. Nevertheless, the existence of KQ variations in the Talmudic period is beyond doubt. In many passages, the Talmud cites a verse or bases some Halachic or Haggadic statement upon it, in a form that coincides with our K.[29] In others it quotes both K and Q,[30] often using the formula כתיב[31] or וקרינן . . . כתיב.[32]

It remains to explain how these KQ variations were integrated into the original group, which consists of guides to the reader. Up to that time, Biblical manuscripts had no marginal notations, except the guides to the reader, that constituted the earliest group

[28] Nedarim 37b. The examples there quoted include two examples according to the Madinchae (Ruth 2:11) את דהגד הוגד, and (Jer 32:11) את דהמצוה, see Norzi on the latter passage. Rabbi Nissim's emendation in his commentary on this Talmudic passage is unnecessary, if the *Madinchae* character of this passage is recognized.

[29] As for example—Dt 22:15 (Ket. 40b); 2 Sam 23:20 (Ber. 18a); Isa 10:13 (Ber. 28a); Isa 30:33 (Men. 100a); Isa 63:9 (Sotah 31a); Jer 21:12 (Shab 55a); Ez 9:11 (Yoma 77a); Ps 139:16 (Yer. Niddah 3:3); Pr 26:2 (Mak 11a); Jb 21:13 (Sanh. 100a).

[30] As e. g. Lev 25:30 (Meg. 3b, 5b).

[31] E. g. Josh 24:3 (Yer. Pes. 10:5); I Sam 2:9 (Yoma 38b); I Sam 7:9 (Abodah Zarah 24b); I Sam 22:18 (Yer. Sanh. 10:2); 2 Sam 21:4 (Yer. Sanh. 6:7); 2 Kings 5:9 (Yer. Sanh. 10:2); Ezek 1:8 (Pes. 119a).

[32] Lev 23:13 (Men 89b): 2 Kings 20:4 (Erub. 26a); Hag 1:8 (Yoma 21b). Bamberger, op. cit., pp. 233–39, who quotes these Talmudic passages, fails to classify them and makes a few minor errors, which we have corrected.

of KQ. By the process of analogy, the new marginal variants were amalgamated with the original body of KQ. Did not the older group read אחריו on the margin for אחרו in the text, or טחורים on the margin for עפלים in the text? Therefore, it was reasoned, the marginal שבות was likewise a Q for the textual K שבית.[33] The *largest* and *latest group* of KQ, then, is the product of the *earliest and most important collation* of Biblical manuscripts of which we have evidence.

Only a limited number of the KQ seem to be of later origin. Thus, the KQ of List 30 where the K writes a Vav which the Q reduces to Kames-hatuph (before Makkeph) seem to belong to the period when vocalization was introduced. An alternative explanation will be found in the introduction to this rubric. Several groups of KQ (Lists 26, 27) seem to register the variations between the Palestinian and Babylonian pronunciation of Aramaic, and probably are not earlier than the Talmudic period. These 62 instances, all told, are few and unimportant additions to the two main groups of Kethib-Qere:— a) the guides to the reader, and b) the textual divergences of ancient manuscripts.

It must be clearly understood, however, in what sense these textual variants may be termed "the later groups of KQ." In point of origin, the majority of these variations, dating from about the first century of the common era, are no later than the guides to the reader. They were, however, subsumed under the Kethib-Qere formula later than the original group. The process by which

[33] It is also possible that these variants became part of the KQ in a slightly different fashion. The Kethib, the *written* text of the archetype, was contrasted with the Qere, the text of the other manuscripts, which were commonly *read*. The explanation given in the text is more likely. If the margin read אחריו and שבית equally, and the first was known as a Qere, a scribe would infer the same of the second.

the manuscript variations were absorbed within the KQ category was not immediate or instantaneous. For a considerable length of time, Biblical manuscripts may have carried on their margins both the guides to the reader and the textual variants. Gradually, the variants began to be considered as identical with the genuine Qere notations, and thus the Kethib-Qere corpus as we know it today came into being.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE TESTIMONY OF THE VERSIONS

It now remains to establish the reaction of the principal ancient versions to the KQ, in order that we may gauge, roughly at least, the antiquity of these variations and discover how far the later synagogal practice of preferring the Q prevailed in earlier times, especially in circles somewhat removed from Rabbinic authority.

Before proceeding with this inquiry, it cannot be overemphasized that it is a difficult and delicate task to establish the underlying text of a version. We may divide the main difficulties as deriving from two sources, a) the nature of the Biblical text itself and b) the method of the translator. On the correct method of establishing Semitic equivalents for the vocabulary of the Greek versions, we have a brilliant and succinct paper by Prof. Margolis.[1] On the method of the ancient translators, there is the very suggestive work of Luzzatto — Oheb Ger.[2] In the case of the KQ where the difference is often one of orthography, grammar or shade of meaning, it is obvious that exact equation is often an impossibility.

We shall first set forth those types of KQ where no decision as to the reading of the versions is possible, because of the *nature of the Biblical text itself.*

[1] In JAOS, vol. 30, part 4, 1910, p. 301–310. The conclusions hold for all the versions with equal force.

[2] (Vienna, 1830). Though the work is limited to Onkelos, the ideas expressed are valid for all the ancient versions; the exact extent of each factor may vary with the translator.

1. The *matres lectionis* (list 3a, b, c,—list 8).

When, for example, we find in I Sa 2:9 חסידו K, חֲסִידָיו Q we have no right to assume that LXX follows the Q because it reads a plural. The Q here, as we have attempted to show, is a guide to the reading, and the divergence between K and Q is merely orthographic. To say that LXX follows the Q is a methodological error.[3]

The only time when we can decide with certainty as to the underlying reading of the Hebrew, is when the versions read a singular or make an error which presupposes one of the two spellings. We must refer the reader to the lists themselves for copious illustrations of this kind. From them we select Jb 26:14 גבורתו K, where LXX, S, P read a singular, and Isa 56:10 צפו K, צִפָּיו Q, where LXX, with its singular capacity for error, reads צַפּוּ! Both these illustrations prove the existence of the Kethib before the translators.

Another common error that permits us to decide the underlying reading is to be found in כלה K, כָּלוֹ Q (list 4), which LXX often reads as כָּלָה, cf. Hos 13:2 Nahum 2:1, Hab 1:9, 15.

In lists 7 and 8, where the Q adds missing vowel letters, the versions are again non-committal, except when they *err.* In list 7, II Ki 20:18 יקח K, יִקָּחוּ Q, LXX reads a singular יִקַּח, thus attesting the reading of the K.

2. *The orthographical variants* (Lists 9–12) and the *archaisms* (Lists 13–25) are likewise difficult to decide upon, when the versions translate correctly. Yet our study of all these passages in the principal versions yields a fair number of cases of error or divergence in translation, that render it easy to establish one

[3] One committed, for example, by Frankel: Vorstudien, in his study of the KQ and LXX. Cf. p. 225 ff. Thus on p. 225, we read: "der Uebersetzer folgt dem Kri wo dieses durch den Plural von Ketib differirt."

or another as the underlying text. For the full results we must refer the reader to the lists themselves and the accompanying sigla. We cite a few examples:

In Ju 17:2 K ואתי אליתי; Q וְאַתְּ אָלִית; LXX reads "and you beswore me" eq. וְאִתִּי אָלִית the K, with אָלִית interpreted in a causative sense. (List 15).

In Ez 16:43, עשיתי K, עָשִׂית Q, S V read עָשִׂיתִי as a first person (ibid).

In Cant 2:13 לכי K, לָךְ Q, LXX read לֵכִי (List 16).

In Dt 21:7, K ידינו לא שפכה, Q שָׁפְכוּ יָדֵינוּ לֹא, P read יָדֵנוּ לֹא שָׁפְכָה as a singular. (List 18).

3. In the *phonetic variants* (List 26–33), where examples of assimilation of Yod to Aleph, Vav to Yod, and the reverse are treated, the versions are similarly inconclusive. Here too the few definite indications available are the result of a misunderstanding of the text. Again a few instances must suffice:

In Ezr 4:9 דהוא K, דָּהֲיָא Q, LXX (B) reads דָּהוּא substantiating the K (List 28).[4]

In Esr 4:4 ומבלהים K, וּמְבַהֲלִים Q, the P transliterates ומבלהין, creating a presumption in favor of the K. (List 33).

4. In the *morphologic variations* (lists 34 ff.), it is often impossible to draw conclusions because of the largely synonymous character of the variations. Here again error in the versions is the only safe clue.

In Pro 16:19 עניים K, עֲנָוִים Q, P reads מכיך עינא presupposing עֵינַיִם, an error graphically closer to the K than to the Q (List 39).

In Pro 20:20 באישון K, בְּאֶשׁוֹן Q, LXX points to the K when it renders "apple of the eye", i. e. אישון (List 42).

In Neh 5:7 נשאים K, נֹשִׁים Q, P substantiates the K by reading נֹשְׂאִים with a Sin (List 43).

[4] See note 133a to the Classification.

In Ez 41:8 מיסדות K, מוֹסָדוֹת Q, T apparently read מְיַסְּדוֹת (List 46).

In Jer 18:22 שיחה K, שׂוּחָה Q, LXX reads שִׂיחָה "conversation" (List 48).

5. Various *grammatical categories*, like gender, syntax of numerals (List 69), the use of particles (List 70), Vav consecutive and weak Vav (List 74), and List 76, use or omission of the definite article[5] (List 77), likewise do not appear in translation. In all these instances, whenever no error occurs, we cannot infer anything as to the underlying text.

Besides these groups, where the nature of the Biblical text itself renders decision impossible, *the method of the translators*, admissible or not as it may seem to us, is often the cause of the difficulty.

Contractions and omissions are highly characteristic of the versions.[6] We frequently meet with freedom in translation, even periphrastic renderings.[7] Akin to this trait is the preference for a smoother reading, be it K or Q or even the result of a tacit emendation on the part of the translator. The use of the collective singular for the plural and vice versa is also quite

[5] It is highly interesting that what is on the surface so easily distinguishable as variations between מלך and המלך should in reality be so difficult. Latin has no article, while Aramaic and Syriac normally use the determinate case even when no article exists in the Hebrew. Hence our only resource for this type of variation is the Greek.

[6] In Lev 25:30 אשר לא חמה is omitted by V. In Jer 31:20 דרך הלכתי and in v. 40 וכל השרמות is omitted by P. The entire Greek Joshua is an extreme example of contraction of the Hebrew original; see Prof. Margolis' critical edition of the LXX of Joshua.

[7] The great periphrasts are Symmachus and the Targums, though no version is entirely free from this tendency. Thus on Nu 3:51 כסף הפדים V r. eam; on Isa 44:24 מי אתי, V r. Nullus mecum—to guard against any infringement of the Divine Power, even negatively.

common.[8] Actives for passives,[9] passives for impersonals,[10] all conspire to render the equating of text and version exceedingly difficult. To make themselves as clear as possible, the ancient versions will normally level all differences in a given proper name that may occur in the text and translate it uniformly.[11]

In all these instances, the underlying text is guaranteed only by an erroneous or divergent translation. In fact we may say, that a translation as literal as Aquila's would be of greater value for textual purposes if it were replete with errors!!![11a] We cannot forego one interesting instance where the Vulgate substantiates beyond the shadow of a doubt a full verse and more of our Masoretic Text and yet has not one word in common with it! In Ps 102:24 f. we read: עִנָּה בַדֶּרֶךְ כֹּחוֹ (כֹּחִי ק') קִצַּר יָמָי: אֹמַר אֵלִי. This the Vulgate renders: Respondit ei in via virtutis suae: paucitatem dierum meorum nuncia mihi. That is: עָנָה בְדֶרֶךְ כֹּחוֹ קִצַּר יָמַי אֶמֹר אֵלַי.

We are now in a position to approach the residue of instances where results *are* forthcoming regarding the reaction of the versions to the KQ,[12] turning first to the Septuagint.

[8] Hence the equating of either חטאתיו or חטאתו (I Ki 16:20) with V "peccatis" is possible, or (I Ki 18:36) דבריך or דברך with V "praeceptum."

[9] Thus on Ps 41:3 cf. V, T.

[10] Thus Ez 48:14 לא ימכרו ולא ימר ולא יעביר is rendered by V "et non transferentur" eq. יעביר המעביר. See also T to Ps 102:24.

[11] G *orna* is used for Hebrew אֶרֶן, אֲרֹנָה, אַרְוָנָה, etc. In II Ch 13:9 the Q עֲפָרִין is disregarded for the better known עֲפָרוֹן by LXX.

[11a] Thus on Isa 9:6 הַמִּשְׂרָה, Aquila renders "measure", (הַמְּשָׂרָה) substantiating המשרה without a doubt.

[12] For the LXX the larger Cambridge Septuagint was used as far as published, (through Samuel), except that Dr. Margolis was kind enough to favor me with the manuscript of his new edition of Joshua. For the rest of the Bible Swete's smaller edition was used. For the Vulgate the edition of Stier and Theile Hand-Polyglotten Bibel (4th ed.) and for the Syriac, Lee's text were utilised. For the Targumim, the edition of the Mikraoth Gedoloth as

Nowhere else does one regret more keenly the absence of a critical text of the LXX along Lagardian lines than in an inquiry such as ours. In a large number of instances the most that can be said is that *manuscripts* of the LXX read so, while others contradict them. Frankel,[13] on the basis of his investigation of the relation of the LXX to the KQ, comes to the following results, which, in spite of differences in detail, are borne out by our investigations as well.

I. The Q is preferred overwhelmingly in Judges, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles and Joshua (when errors in proper names are excluded).

II. The Q is more common than the K in Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Psalms.

III. No conclusion as to KQ can be drawn from Pentateuch, Minor Prophets, Megilloth, Ezra, Nehemiah, because of the small number of examples occurring, or from Proverbs and Job because of the inexactness of translation.

Our own numerical results will be found at the end of the chapter. Suffice it to point out here that in no book of the Bible is the K as common as the Q.

We are interested in drawing two conclusions from these facts:—

A. The marked preference shown for the Q by LXX, gives us a much earlier terminus a quo for the tendency we have noted in Rabbinic Judaism to insist on the Q as the only admis-

well as Lagarde's Prophetae Chaldaice and the emendations on the Targum on Psalms in Luzzatto's Oheb Ger served as our text. Field's Hexapla as well as the minor additions found in the larger Cambridge LXX, is our source for Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, as well as for an occasional reference to Quinta and *ho Hebraios*.

[13] Vorstudien zur Septuaginta p. 219–242.

sible text in public reading.[14] Yet this conclusion is partially modified by the second.

B. The existence of the Q before the LXX can be imagined in one of two ways. Either they possessed a manuscript with the Qarian on the margin, or the readings which to-day are our Q existed as ordinary textual readings in the codices used by the translators. The former hypothesis appears to us highly untenable. It involves the assumption of flourishing Masoretic activity before 250 B. C. E., the date of the translation of the Pentateuch. We must therefore fall back upon the second view, namely, that in the manuscripts before the LXX many of our Qarian existed as ordinary readings.

This is a powerful argument in favor of our thesis that the later and larger group of Qarian are variants and not corrections. Moreover, another interesting consideration supports this view. The ratio of Q to K readings in the LXX is 1.68 to 1. If we remember the fact that the ratio of preferable Qarian to preferable Kethiban is 1.5 to 1, it becomes apparent that there is only a slight margin of *intrinsic* preference for the Q manifested by the LXX. In other words, the Q is followed by LXX only a little more than is warranted by the superiority of the Q readings over the K.

Likewise supporting the conclusion that the LXX found our Q as manuscript readings are the examples where the LXX *misread* the Q. A particularly striking instance occurs in Josh 3:16, Q הַרְחַק מְאֹד מֵאָדָם which the LXX renders הַרְחַק מְאֹד מְאֹד. It is much more probable that this error arose with מֵאָדָם

[14] It must be remembered that the LXX version is really a long series of translations extending perhaps for centuries. The latest book to be translated into Greek *may* already have possessed the Qarian on the margin, and this may possibly account for the predilection for the Q.

in the text, rather than from a codex that read הַרְחֵק מְאֹד בְּאָדָם in the text and had מֵאָדָם on the margin.

Similarly, in II Sa 21:6, the Q יְתַּן is misread by the LXX as יִתֵּן. Here, too, had the text contained the K ינתן and the margin, the Q יתן, the error would have been much less likely.

Again, in Jer 51:13, the K שׁכנתי in the text with the Q שֹׁכְנֹתֵךְ on the margin could hardly have led to the misreading שֹׁכְנֹת of the LXX, which is much more easily explained if the Q was in the text.[15]

In Ez 25:9 the K is קריתמה, the Q קִרְיָתֵימָה. The LXX reading of the Q קִרְיַת יָמָה as two words seems to derive from a textual rather than a marginal reading, as in the illustrations above.

For all these reasons, cumulatively viewed, we believe that it is indisputable that the LXX had most of our Q as a textual reading.

It remains to notice the passages where different Greek uncials differ as to the KQ. In this list B represents the Vaticanus, A the Alexandrinus, Aleph the Sinaiticus, and Q, the Marchalianus.

	Kethib	*Qere*
I Ki 12:3	ויבאו B omits;	ויבא A
17:15	הוא והיא A;	היא והוא B
II Ki 17:31	אלה ספרים B?;	אלהי ספרוים A
Jer 48:5	הלחות B;	א הלחית

[15] The last example cannot be pressed, as the final Yod could very easily have become illegible or erased, so that the K could have served equally well as the basis for LXX. Thus in Jer 4:19, the K שמעתי נפשי is rendered by all the versions G P V T as "my soul has heard" as though the text were שָׁמְעָה נַפְשִׁי; yet the late dates of V and T preclude the possibility of the Q occurring in the text.

	Kethib	*Qere*
Ez 3:20	צדקתו A sing.;	צדקתיו B
45:5	יהיה A;	והיה B
Nahum 2:6	בהליכותם (acc. Gins.) A;	בהליכתם B
Psalm 24:4	נפשו B;	נַפְשִׁי A
La 1:18	עמים א;	העמים B
5:7	אינם B;	ואינם Q
Ecc 10:20	הכנפים B;	כנפים א AC
Est 9:19	הפרוזים א c.a.	הפרזים B?
Esr 2:46	שמלי B;	שלמי A
2:50	נפיסים B;	נפוסים A
4:9	דהוא B;	דהיא A
8:14	וחבוד A;	וזכור B omits
I Ch 8:25	פניאל B;	פנואל A
12:3	ויואל B different;	ויזיאל A

From these examples the only possible conclusion is that B seems to follow the K, and A follows the Q, waveringly in the Prophets, and somewhat more consistently in the Hagiographa.

For the other versions, the reader is referred to the tables with which this chapter closes, and to the detailed "Classification of the KQ" at the end of the work.

It remains to notice Aquila's reaction to the KQ. The view that Aquila follows the K uniformly has already been disproved by Reider,[16] who nevertheless points out that Aquila follows the K in cases where LXX prefers the Q. The following is a list of cases where Aquila follows our K:[17]

[16] Prolegomena to a Greek-Hebrew and Hebrew-Greek Index to Aquila, p. 87.

[17] We differ from Reider as follows: of his 13 K examples we accept eleven and add eleven more. Of his 17 Q's, we accept 13 and add 12 others. See pp. 94–95 for Reider's list.

שמ' כא, 8 לא; דב' כח, 30 ישגלנה[18]; יש' ט, 2 לא; טז, 3 הביאו; יר' ט, 7 שוחט; – כד, 9 זועה[19]; מ, 8 עופי; יח' כג, 42 סובאים; מג, 29 ידו; תה' י, 10 ודכה; עא, 20 הראיתנו; קה, 28 דבריו; קכג 4, לגאיונים; קלט, 16 ולא; קמה, 6 וגדלותיך; קמז, 19, דברו; משׁ' ו, 16 תועבות; כא, 29 יכין; אי' יט, 29 שדין?; לז, 12 בתחבולתו; דנ' יא, 10 מעזה; דבא' כה, 1 הנביאים.

Aquila follows our Qere in these instances:

בר' ל, 11 בא גד; דב' לג 2, אשׁ דת; יה' ג, 16 מאדם; שמא' יד, 27 ותארנה; שמב' ג, 15 ליש; כ, 23 הכרתי; מלא' יב, 3 ויבא; מלב' יב, 10 מימין; יש' לו, 12 צואתם . . . ומימי רגליהם; מט, 5, לו; יר' לב, 23 ובתורתך; מח, 5 הלחית; נ, 11 תשמחו . . . תצהלו; נא, 34 אכלני; יח' כג, 43 יזנו; תה' יא, 1 נודי; ל, 4 מירדי; נה, 16 ישיא מות; ק, 3 ולו; קמח, 2 צבאיו; משׁ' כג, 5 יעוף; אי' יג, 15 לו; לח, 12 השחר; קה' י, 20 בעל הכנפים[20]; דנ' ט, 24 ולהתם.

In brief, Aquila follows the K, 22, and the Q, 25 times, and though conclusions from such meagre data are precarious, it must be said that Aquila's fondness for the K is astonishing, considering his close connection with Rabbinism.

The other direct emanations of Rabbinic Judaism are much more closely wedded to the Q, Onkelos, Jerushalmi and Fragment-Targum following the Q exclusively. The Targum to the Prophets and the Hagiographa shows a preponderance of Q over K of five to one. Even Vulgate with a ratio of three to one and Peshitta with a ratio of two and a half to one, bear witness to the widespread character of the tendency, which later became law, of preferring the Q to the K.

[18] Cf. Aquila's rendering of Ps 45:10 שְׁנָל by *synkoitos*.

[19] Aquila (so S) renders "tottering," going back to זוע. Hence more probably the K זועה.

[20] Reading בעל כנף?

Table One

The Septuagint

	KETHIB			*QERE*		
Book	Certain	Doubtful	Total	Certain	Doubtful	Total
Pent	1	4	5	14	2	16
Joshua	8	2	10	11	2	13
Judges	6	–	6	9	–	9
Samuel	12	5	17	38	10	48
Kings	24	5	29	31	3	34
Isaiah	10	4	14	15	4	19
Jeremiah	25	4	29	39	5	44
Ezekiel	33	2	35	38	4	42
XII	8	1	9	7	3	10
Psalms	20	3	23	25	3	28
Proverbs	13	–	13	17	3	20
Job	7	1	8	8	3	11
Megilloth	13	1	14	15	1	16
Daniel	4	2	6	5	5	10
Ezra	8	–	8	10	1	11
Nehemiah	8	1	9	11	–	11
Chronicles	13	3	16	27	2	29
TOTAL	213	38	251	320	51	371

Table Two

The Reaction of the Versions to the KQ

	KETHIB			*QERE*		
Book	Certain	Doubtful	Total	Certain	Doubtful	Total
LXX	213	38	251	320	51	371
Aquila	21	1	22	23	2	25
Symmachus	38	5	43	61	9	70
Theodotion	24	5	29	32	6	38
Peshitta	122	32	154	328	35	363
Vulgate	124	40	164	330	51	381
Targum to Prophets	56	21	77	372	44	416
Onkelos				16	2	18
Jerusalem Tar.				15	1	16
Fragment Targum				2	–	2

Chapter Six

THE MINOR GROUPS OF KETHIB-QERE

The model codex of which we have spoken in Chapter Four, undoubtedly performed a great if imperfect service in the interest of uniformity; it established one text as authentic, by which all others were to be corrected. Had photography existed, it would have been possible to stereotype the text completely. As it was, however, new errors raised their heads immediately. We may be certain that the very first scribe who copied the archetype was responsible for new variants. Nevertheless, the archetype was of signal value in stemming the tide of variation.

With the destruction of the center of Jewish life in Palestine and the probable loss of this codex during the destruction of the Temple or the later days of Roman oppression, this uniformity seemed irreparably shattered. The only resource left the Masoretes was the compilation of rubrics, wherein the KQ were catalogued under some common property. By referring to these lists, though no standard manuscript was available any longer for comparison,[1] the scribe could keep his text reasonably free from error. Nevertheless, a host of variations did arise,[2] which may most conveniently be divided into two classes: (a) individual aberrations of scribes and (b) variations sponsored by schools.

[1] On the famous Hilleli, Ben-Asher and other codices, see Strack: Proleg. Crit. p. 14 ff.

[2] See the collations of Kennicott, De Rossi and Ginsburg, who surveyed only a portion of the available material. The lack of importance of most of these variations is evidence of the large measure of success enjoyed by the archetype and its descendants; their frequent occurrence illustrates the large liability to error on the part of scribes.

By the first group, we mean those variations which an individual scribe introduced into the text, consciously, or, in the main, unconsciously. Inasmuch as they possessed no validity, they could easily be eliminated by consulting the Masoretic rubrics. Yet manuscripts are replete with these "spurious" KQ, the chief value of which lies in their aid in establishing the non-Masoretic character of the codices in question. Thus manuscripts No. 3 and 13 in Ginsburg's collation are very often at variance with the Masorah. But to revert to our subject, from the comparatively small number (45) of manuscripts that he collated for Genesis, Ginsburg elicited as many as *ten* spurious KQ.[3] We believe that a short analysis of these spurious examples will throw light on the method of error, so to speak, and possibly be of service in estimating the value of other variations, where no standard of comparison is preserved.

These spurious KQ in Genesis may be divided into the following classes:

A. *Matres lectionis*. In two passages 8:22 and 19:12, where our text reads עֹד with a note in the Masorah Parva חסר י"ד (i. e. sine Vav; 14 examples all told of this spelling), several manuscripts read עַד Kethib, עוֹד Qere. It is apparent that these KQ are prompted by some scribe's attempt to guard the reading with Ḥolem. In other words, these spurious examples are kindred to the original classes of KQ—the matres lectionis.[4]

Also in 48:11, where our text reads רְאֹה פָנֶיךָ, there are manuscripts which have רְאֵה as K and רְאוֹ as Q. Here we have in

[3] See Ginsburg: The Massorah vol. II, letter Kaph, list #488 ff, and the collations of Kennicott and De Rossi passim. The uncritical character of Ginsburg's great compilation must again be mentioned. Not only are no sources for his notations given, but the spurious KQ are in no way set apart from the genuine examples.

[4] See chapter III and lists 3–8.

the first place an alternative orthography for the infinitive (He instead of Vav) and then a Q to guide the reader. Likewise in 49:10, the crux שִׁילֹה of our text is given by some manuscripts as containing שִׁילֹה K and שִׁילוֹ Q. Here it is manifest that the Q is a guide against reading otherwise than with a Ḥolem. These examples bear obvious resemblance to Lists #3, a, b, c, 4.

B. *Erroneous KQ due to analogy.* In Genesis 36:18, where our text has יְעוּשׁ, some manuscripts read יעיש K, יְעוּשׁ Q. This is either a downright error for the KQ that occurs in vv. 5, 14, or is due to a false analogy from these genuine KQ. Likewise in Genesis 39:22[5] some manuscripts have a K האסירים with a Q הָאֲסוּרִים, an obvious error from the actual KQ on the same word in 39:20. Similarly, on 50:26, where our text reads וַיִּישָּׂם a spurious K, ויישם Q וַיּוּשַׂם occurs—apparently based on the analogy of 24:33.

C. *Errors due to other causes.* On Genesis 34:27 there is a spurious KQ בני יעקב בא—בא K, בָּאוּ Q. On 36:15 we have a K תומן, Q תֵּימָן, where the Q in each case is our textual reading. Though analogies for both these KQ may be supplied from the genuine corpus,[6] they are unanimously rejected by all reputable codices and authorities.

From these spurious examples, we feel justified in drawing the following conclusions:

1. The spurious KQ are in no wise different from the genuine groups, consisting as they do of guides to the reader and manuscript variations. These variants, like those of the genuine corpus, may consist of equally admissible readings (אסורים, אסירים) or of obvious errors. (So תומן, תימן: cf. כמוש, כמיש).

[5] See Norzi ad locum.

[6] Cf., list 7, 8 (Vav). On the latter see Jer 48:7 (כמיש).

2. These spurious KQ are rejected not only by the unanimous opinion of Masoretic scholars from Norzi downwards, but by the overwhelming majority of codices. On the other hand, the genuine corpus is accepted with equal completeness by authorities and manuscripts alike.
3. This practical unanimity on the subject of the KQ, seems to point to the same conclusion as their complete agreement on other features of the textus receptus, as e. g. minuscules and majuscules, dotted words, etc. Just as these characteristics go back to one codex, so all genuine KQ readings ultimately and largely go back to one source—the same archetypal codex which contained practically all the KQ on the margin.[7] The spurious KQ being later, they never were uniformly incorporated into the Biblical text.

— — — —

Besides these individual variants which received no sanction, the KQ plays a part in the divergences between the Madinchae and Ma'arbae.[8] The difference between the two schools on the subject of the KQ is of two kinds: (1) where the Madinchae text is fixed and the Ma'arbae have a KQ (in which we have noted this fact by appending the letters "Md" i. e. Madinchae, to the reading adopted by them, be it K or Q to the Ma'arbae) and (2) where the Ma'arbae reading is fixed and the Madinchae

[7] We say "practically," because one group at least, list #30, containing the reduction of the Holem to Kames-Hatuph before Makkeph cannot be earlier than the introduction of the vocalic system. A presumption likewise exists that the Aramaic examples in the phonetic groups #22–26 *may* be preserving the current Aramaic pronunciation of a later time. An alternative view is discussed in the introduction to these lists.

[8] On these schools cf. Strack, Proleg. Crit. p. 36–41, Geiger, Urschrift p. 481–490, Buhl: op. cit. p. 90–93 and literature there cited. Weiss: Dor Dor ve Dorshav IV, p. 252–4.

have a KQ. These KQ we have classified in classes analogous to our regular lists, numbering them A, as e. g. 9A, 13A, 62A etc.

A study of the Classification will show that they fall easily and naturally into the same categories as the original KQ.[9] They will therefore receive whatever elucidation they require in the individual notes. What is of importance here is the ascertaining of the antiquity of these Madinchae readings.

It may be said that the opinion of scholars[10] regarding the relative age of these variations is thoroughly substantiated by the versions. What is more, we find no ancient translation (except perhaps the Targum) that reads according to one school exclusively. Often within the same book, readings of both schools are followed. The only tenable conclusion is that originally these readings were all current, and hence were followed indiscriminately by the different translators. With the later crystallization of definite Masoretic schools, some readings were accepted as official in one school and others in another. We now turn to the details of the reaction of the versions to the KQ of the Madinchae-Ma'arbae schools, as evidence of the antiquity of these variations.

SEPTUAGINT

LXX follows the Madinchae:

A. *certainly* in Josh 15:53 (K יְנִים);[11] 2 Ki 25:12 (K גֹּבִים);[12] Isa 23:12 (K תּוֹסִיפוּ); Jer 9:21 (K הָאֲדָמָה Q הַשָּׂדֶה both combined in LXX); Jer 29:22 (Q אַחְאָב LXX *Achiab*);

[9] The only exception is the fourteen examples where הִיא is spelled הוּא by the Madinchae, like the usual Pentateuchal spelling of this pronoun.

[10] Geiger: Urschrift p. 481; Margolis, orally to the writer.

[11] Given as a Mad. reading by Baer.

[12] Given as a Mad. reading by Baer. Codex A reads. *gebein* eq. גבים. B reads *tabein* an error for *gabein* in uncial script, where Gamma and Tau look alike, likewise substantiating the K.

Ezek 13:2, 17 (Q עַל);[13] Ezek 22:4 (Q עֵת); Ezek 22:13 (K עַל); Ezek 43:26 (K וכפרו); Ezek 48:28 (K מריבות);[14] Ps 22:24 (K יגורו); Jb 23:8 (K ואינני); Jb 37:19 (K הודעני); Lam 3:32 (K חסדו).

B. *probably* in 2 Ki 17:24 (וספרוים);[15] Ps 139:16 (ולא)[15] Jb 41:4 (לא).[15] In these instances, the reading may belong to either school, since the K of one school is Q or textual reading to the other. But inasmuch as the general tendency is to read the Q (see chapter V), even on the part of the LXX, the probability is that they belong to the Madinchae.

C. The Greek codices follow different schools:

2 Ki 18:29	A follows K Md מידי;	B מידו	Maar or Q Md
Ju 8:22	A follows Q Md ויאמר;	B ויאמרו	Maar or K Md
Jb 5:5	B follows K Md ישאף;	A ושאף	Maar or Q Md
Esr 10:3	B follows Q Md כעצת;	c א a בעצת	Maar or K Md

D. *Doubtfully*. In these cases, the rendering of LXX is no guide to the underlying reading, because the other is manifestly impossible and the translator helps himself as best he can. Ez 46:6 (Q Md תָּמִים).

LXX follows the Maarbae:

A. *probably* in Josh 8:13 (לעיר bis);[16] Ju 1:21 (יֹשֵׁב or K Md); Jer 51:29 (קָמָה or K Md);[17] Ez 17:14 (לְעמדה or K Md); Am 9:7 (בני ישׂראל or K Md) Mi 6:5 (מַה or K Md).[18]

[13] It is however possible that in translating, the Maarbae אֶל is interpreted as עַל.

[14] All the readings *barimoth* (Cod. B) *marimoth* (Cod. Q) contain the long vowel "oth" of the K Md.

[15] Perhaps the LXX reads the Kethib of Maarbae.

[16] See Margolis: Ai or the City in JQR, NS VII, 1917 p. 491 ff.

[17] The entire phrase is read as a singular: קָמָה עַל בָּבֶל מַחֲשָׁבַת ה'.

[18] The Q Md מִי is an impossibility, so that even with that reading before them, the translators would be constrained to read as do the Maarbae מַה.

AQUILA, SYMMACHUS, THEODOTION

Here too Mad readings predominate, though not exclusively.

A, S, T, read the *Madinchae* text:

A. *certainly* in Josh 6:15 בַּעֲלוֹת (K) alii[19]

8:12 בית און (K) supplied sub asterisko.[20]

Isa 38:14 כסיס עגור (K) Th transliterates σισ.

Ez 5:11 אגדע (Q) S.[21]

Jb 5:5 ישאף (K) AS.[22]

B. *probably* in Ps 139:16 (לא or K Maar).

A, S, T, read the *Maarbae* text:

A. *certainly* in Jer 45:4 ואת כל הארץ היא AS.[23]

Ez 22:4 עד־שנותיך Th.[24]

PESHITTA

Here too readings of both schools are met with, with Madinchae in the majority.

Peshitta read the *Madinchae* text:

A. *certainly* in Jer 6:6 (Q כְּלוֹ); Ez 13:2, 17 (Q עַל); 22:4 (Q עֵת); 32:26 (Q חתית); 43:26 (K וכפרו); Joel 1:12 (K וכל־עצי); Jb 23:8 (K ואינני); 37:19 (K הודעני); Ecc 9:9 (K היא);[25] Neh 7:15 (Q בְּנֵי).[26]

[19] "Alii" means some undetermined translation of the Three.

[20] Hence belonging to one of the Three. Field is unaware of the existence of a Mad. reading here, and equates *Bethaun* with בֵּית אֵל the Maarbae reading!

[21] So Field.

[22] No "and" is expressed in AΣ. Perhaps merely freedom, though unlikely in the case of A.

[23] This reading which is Q to the Md is greatly inferior to the K of the Md ואת כל הארץ לי היא, which the Vss. would certainly have followed had they had that reading before them.

[24] Here, too, the superior reading עַת שְׁנוֹתַיִךְ (Q to the Md) would certainly have been preferred if Th. had known of the Mad reading at this point.

[25] On the Vss. here see Euringer: Der Masorahtext des Qoheleth, ad loc.

[26] The Maar reading is בְּנוּי. P reads בָּנֵי, the consonants of the Q Md בְּנֵי.

B. *probably* in Ps 139:16 (וְלֹא or K Maar); Jb 41:4 (לֹא or K Maar).

Peshitta read the *Maarbae* text:

A. *certainly* in Josh 8:13 (לָעִיר bis); 2 Ki 17:24 (Q וּמִסְפָּרַוִים); 21:12 (Q שְׁמָעָה).

B. *probably* in I Ki 20:33 (Q ויחלטוה ממנו);[27] Am 9:7 (בְּנֵי or K Md); Mic 6:5 (מה יעץ or K Md).

VULGATE

The evidence from the Vulgate is extraordinarily hard to summarise, because of the frequently periphrastic character of Jerome's renderings. Nevertheless, a substantial number of Madinchae readings do emerge. The Vulgate read the *Madinchae* text:

A. *certainly* in II Ki 18:19 מידי K; Jer 29:22 אחאב Q (V—Achab); Ez 5:11 אגדע Q; 22:4 עת Q; I Ch 5:14 יַחְדּוֹ Q (V—Jeddo);[29] 6:29 קוּשִׁי K (V—Cusi).[30]

B. *doubtfully* in Ez 46:6 תָּמִים Q;[31] Jb 22:24 יָשִׁית K;[32] Ecc 9:7 הִיא K.[33]

TARGUM TO THE PROPHETS

On the adherence of Targum Jonathan to the Madinchae a great deal has been written. Pinsker[34] advanced the view that, whether due to composition or final redaction in Babylon, the Targum follows the Madinchae readings. This was energetically

[27] The Md reading ויחלטו הממנו is impossible to convey in translation.

[28] The Q Md מי יעץ is meaningless.

[29] The K Md and the Maar text is יַחְדִי.

[30] The Q Md and the Maar text is קִישִׁי.

[31] The Maar text תָּמִימִם is difficult and a singular is given by all the Vss.

[32] The V expresses no "and", thus probably reading K Md יָשִׁית rather than Q Md or Maar text וְשִׁית. G (A) PT express the "and".

[33] The K Md is כִּי הִיא חֲלָקֵךְ. V: Haec est pars. Yet the feminine 'haec" may be merely an agreement with the predicative nominative, the normal in classic Latin. Cf. Vergil's famous line: 'Hic labor, hoc opus est".

[34] מבוא לנקוד האשורי p. 124.

challenged by Weiss[35] who submitted a list of Maarbae readings in the Former Prophets. Our concern is of course only with the KQ element in the Mad.-Maarb. variations. Within its limits, our evidence tends to support Pinsker, notwithstanding Weiss' strictures. Only *four* Maarbae readings emerge, and all in the Former Prophets, while the number of Madinchae readings, both in the Former as well as in the Latter Prophets, is much larger. According to the view that the Targum was originally composed in Palestine and redacted in Babylonia, there is no difficulty in assuming that a small number of Maarbae readings escaped the redactor's hand, tho the majority are Madinchae.

Targum read the *Madinchae* text:

A. *certainly* in Josh 3:17 ארון ברית Q;[36] Ju 1:22 ישבי Q;[37] II Sa 6:23 וָלָד K; Jer 6:6 כֻּלּוֹ Q; 33:3 וּנְצֻרוֹת K (Vide Kimhi ad loc.); 45:4 ואת כל הארץ לי היא K; Ez 5:11 אגדע Q; 13:2, 17 Q עַל;[38] 17:14 לעמדו Q;[39] 22:4 עֵת Q; Am 9:7 בית ישראל Q; Zech 13:7 עֲמִיתוֹ K.[40]

B. *probably* in II Ki 21:12 שמעיו (Md text rather than K Maar): Ez 46:6 תָּמִים Q.

Targum read the *Maarbae* text:

A. *certainly* in Josh 8:13 לָעִיר bis;[41] Ju 13:17 כי יבא דבריך K;[42] 2 Ki 17:24 ומספרוים Q.

B. *probably* in Ju 8:22 ויאמרו (text of Maar and K Md): Mic 6:5 מה יעץ (text of Maar and K Md).

[35] Dor Dor veDorshav vol. iv, p. 253 f. and note.

[36] See note on list 77A for evidence that Q Md was here read.

[37] See note on passage in Classification.

[38] If not אֶל interpreted as עַל.

[39] If the vocalisation in the ordinary editions (לְמִפְלֶחָה eq. Q) is correct—a very precarious assumption.

[40] See note on passage in Classification.

[41] On the confusion as to עִיר and עִי see Professor Margolis' paper quoted above.

[42] T: ארי יתקימון פתגמך.

TARGUM TO THE HAGIOGRAPHA

This version shows a striking adherence to the Madinchae text. In view of the persistent tradition of a Targum of Rab Joseph, and the telling instance of II Ch 33:13, which will be discussed below, we feel doubtful about the regnant view that places the authorship of this Targum in Palestine.[43]

Targum read the *Madinchae* text:

A. *certainly* in Jb 6:21 לא K;[44] Ecc 9:9 היא K; I Ch 5:14 יחדו Q;[45] II Ch 33:13 (discussed below).

B. *doubtfully* in La 4:17 עוֹדֵינָה תִּכְלֶינָה עֵינֵינוּ, where the Targum reads: עוד ספאן עיננא, which may nevertheless be an inexact rendering of the Maarbae text (Q) עוֹדֵינוּ תִּכְלֶינָה עֵינֵינוּ.

We now revert to the passage II Ch 33:13. Maarbae: וַיִּתְפַּלֵּל אֵלָיו וַיֵּעָתֶר לוֹ Madinchae ויחתר כתיב ויעתר קרי. It is the latter text, we believe, that is expanded midrashically by the Targum, who combines both the K and the Q in this fashion: ועבד חרכא ומחתרתא בשמיא תחות כורסי יקריה (=חתר) ושמע צלותיה (=ויעתר).

It may be objected that the midrashic rendering of the Targum has no foundation in a textual variant but goes back to a play on the Heth and the Ayin. It is well known that in certain districts like Galilee, Heth and Ayin were pronounced alike. This, it seems, was also true of the Samaritan dialect.[46] Aleph and Heth were similarly liable to confusion and served as the

[43] See Buhl, p. 177, 182; Wellhausen-Bleek: Einleitung in das A T p. 565.

[44] See Norzi ad loc.

[45] According to Baer, the reading יַחְדוּ is Q to the Md, while יַחְדִי is K Md and Maar text.

[46] See the examples collected by Heller: Samaritan Pent. p. 6 note 5 where Heth and Ayin are interchanged.

basis for homiletic applications. In Genesis Rabbah 15:12, we read:

אימה זו בבל דכתיב באדין נבוכדנצר אתמלי חמה

Yet in spite of this fact, it seems almost certain that in our case, we are dealing with an underlying textual variation. Our proof is to be found in Debarim Rabbah section 2, where our verse is quoted. The text reads: שלא יהו אומרים הרי מנשה ביקש לעשות תשובה ולא נתקבל לפיכך הריני עונה אותך. מניין שנאמר ויתפלל אליו ויעתר לו. ו י ח ת ר ל ו. מלמד שהיו מלאכי השרת מסתמין את החלונות של רקיע . . . מה עשה הקב"ה חתר את הרקיע מתחת כסא הכבוד.

What we expect is ויחתר לו כתיב, and there is no doubt that the words are here quoted as from a scriptural text, because a *homiletic conceit is deduced from it.*

TALMUD

It has been generally overlooked that the Babylonian Talmud has Madinchae KQ three times. In Nedarim 37b, two Kethiban vela Karian are quoted (את דהמצוה Jer 32:11 and את דהגד הוגד Ru 3:5). In Sanhedrin 20a, the Madinchae K and Q of II Sa 3:35 are both used in a Haggadic interpretation: דרש רבא מאי דכתיב ויבא כל העם להברות את דוד וכתיב להברות וקרי להכרות בתחלה להכרותו ובסופו להברותו.

Notwithstanding certain difficulties in the utilisation of the versions for delicate textual purposes, they have brought welcome evidence of the antiquity of both types of reading, as antedating their respective schools.

It becomes evident too, that the archetype was to some extent ineffectual in stemming the tide of variation, and that divergences, some individual and others sanctioned by schools, never ceased to arise.

We append a chart showing the numerical distribution of the Madinchae-Maarbae readings among the versions.

	MADINCHAE			*MAARBAE*		
	CERTAIN	DOUBTFUL	TOTAL	CERTAIN	DOUBTFUL	TOTAL
LXX	15	4	19	–	7	7
A, S, Th	5	1	6	2	–	2
Peshitta	11	2	13	3	3	6
Vulgate	6	3	9	–	–	–
Targum-Prophets	12	2	14	4	2	6
Targum-Hagiographa	4	1	5	–	–	–

The earliest Masoretic use of the term Kethib-Qere is, as we have seen in chapter III, a literal use of the term. The margin directed the reader to read so-and-so, when the text wrote otherwise. It seems, however, that the term was also used in another sense which is to be met with in the Talmud and Midrashim, and which has been frequently misunderstood.

The reader is acquainted with the Rabbinic formula *al tikre*. Here no textual change is intended; for the purpose of edification, a word is quoted from a verse and slightly modified.[47] One familiar example will suffice.[48]

תנא דבי אליהו כל השונה הלכות בכל יום מובטח לו שהוא בן העולם הבא שנאמר הֲלִיכוֹת עוֹלָם לוֹ אל תקרי הֲלִיכוֹת אלא הֲלָכוֹת.

"Whoever studies daily the legal portions of the Talmud, may be certain of the world-to-come, as it is said (Hab 3:6), 'The ways of the world are his.' Read, not *halichoth* (ways) but *halachoth* (laws)!"

It would seem that parallel in usage to the formula . . . שנאמר אל תקרי there was another: . . . כתיב וקרי or, more exactly, that the formula in its complete form sounds like this:—

$$\ldots\ldots \begin{Bmatrix} \text{שנאמר} \\ \text{or} \\ \text{כתיב} \end{Bmatrix} \ldots\ldots\ldots \text{אל תקרי} \ldots\ldots \text{אלא וקרי}$$

[47] This term has been exhaustively treated by S. Bamberger קורא באמת (1871–8); see also his נחלי דבש p. 69a (1867).

[48] Megillah 28b and parallel.

This cumbersome formula was broken up into the negative שנאמר . . . אל תקרי and the affirmative כתיב . . . וקרי,[49] each one, however, merely introducing a *homiletic explanation* based on a play in the text. If this use of the Kethib-Qere formula is kept in mind, some of the alleged discrepancies between Talmud and Masorah, where the former has a KQ unknown to the latter, disappear. We quote some examples of this type of KQ; in each case the *al tikre* formula could have been substituted:[50]

ברא יח, 15 ויאמר לו כי צחקת לו כתיב לא קרי[51] (מדרש שכל טוב)
שמא' ב, 22 את אשר ישכבון ישכיבון כתיב אמר רבי שהיו הנשים
מביאות קיניהן ליטהר לבעליהן[51a] (ירו' כתובות, יג', א')
מלב' ה, 20 ולקחתי מאתו מאומה מומה כתיב (ירו' סנהדרין יא.)
מלב' ב, 9 תעשה לו תעשה לא כתיב (זוהר, משפטים)
יח' יט, 9 ויתנוהו בסוגר בחחים ר"א בר נתן אומר חי שלשלו אותו
כד"א ויתנוהו בסוגר בחחים בחיים כתיב (ויק' רבה, יט)
מי' ד, 10 ושכנת בשדה אף על פי שאתה גולה בשדה שכינתי לא
זזה (ירו' סוכה ז, ג: תנח' נח)[52]
תה' פ' 14 יכרסמנה חזיר מיער מיאור כתיב (אבות דרבי נתן, לד)
תה' קה, 22 לאסר שריו שרו כתיב זה פוטיפר[53] (מדרש שוחר טוב)

[49] It is for this reason that we prefer to regard *Qere* as an imperative parallel to *al tikre*, rather than as a participle passive, with gerundive force, though the difference is hardly material for our main conclusions.

[50] In Otzar Yisrael, vol. 9, p. 228, most of these examples are erroneously taken to represent divergences between Talmud and Masorah. It will be plain that they all occur in Agadic remarks; now a hypothetical Kethib, now a Qere is used as the basis of the Derash. On all these passages, Norzi is of prime importance, because of his full quotations from Rabbinic literature on the affected passages. See also Ehrentreu: op. cit. p. 25, note 1.

[51] Inasmuch as the Biblical text is inexactly quoted by the Midrash, it may perhaps be emended to: — ויאמר לא כי צחקת לא כתיב לו קרי.

[51a] Bamberger, p. 237 is puzzled by this KQ quoted in the Talmud.

[52] This may refer to another manuscript written with the archaic ending וְשָׁכְנְתִי. More probably the divergence is merely homiletic.

[53] There may have been a manuscript written defectiva.

As Masoretic studies increased in importance and in popularity, it seemed preferable to differentiate between the homiletic and the textual applications of the formula, so that *Al tikre* was reserved for the former purpose, and *Kethib-Qere* became the regular means of transmitting textual divergences. Nevertheless, we find the latter used homiletically down to Menahem b. Solomon's Shoher Tob (1139), which may, however, merely be quoting older sources.

It thus becomes clear that besides the existence of KQ in the body of Madinchae-Maarbae variations, the formula occurs in spurious examples, and as a homiletic device. These minor groups must be kept distinct from the main body of genuine KQ.

The history of the KQ bears on its surface the marks of the incessant flux and development characteristic of the Jew and his heritage. Beginning with the Divine Name itself, the KQ was originally concerned with the prevention of blasphemy and indecency in the public reading of Scripture. In the absence of a vocalic system, it was also utilized to aid in the correct reading. Nor did these constitute all its functions. The KQ apparatus was again invoked as an instrument for the preservation of ancient textual variants.

It seems highly probable that these readings resulted from a comparison of the archetype and several other standard codices, shortly before the destruction of the Temple. On this view, the KQ preserves the record of the earliest and most important collation of Biblical manuscripts known.

Our investigation, we hope, has shed light upon the history of Hebrew vocalization, the transmission of the text, and kindred problems. But more important, we have gained some insight

into the work of these pious and obscure men, known to posterity as the Masoretes, who, under varying and often difficult conditions, toiled over the Biblical text and guarded it with loving vigilance, that God's Word might be transmitted to the coming generations, unchanged and unimpaired. The imposing edifice of their work, vast yet minute, ambitious but unassuming, arouses in our hearts a sense of awe and gratitude.

APPENDIX A

The Detailed Results of the Analysis

Relative Value of the KQ

1. K and Q equally satisfactory			
	a. definite	657	
	b. doubtful	58	
	Total		715
2. K and Q equally unsatisfactory			
	a. definite	25	
	b. doubtful	4	
	Total		29
3. K superior to Q			
	a. definite	108	
	b. doubtful	25	
	Total		133
4. Q superior to K			
	a. definite	132	
	b. doubtful	68	
	Total		200
GRAND TOTAL		1077	
Lists #1–8		273	
		1350	

Percentage Totals

K and Q equally satisfactory	66.38%
K and Q equally unsatisfactory	2.69%
K superior to Q	12.34%
Q superior to K	18.57%

APPENDIX B

The Classification of the KQ

Notations and Abbreviations

1. The vocalization of the K is not Masoretic. It represents the author's interpretation of the reading.
2. The symbol Md—מד following a word in the Classification means that the reading is both Kethib and Qere to the Madinchae school.
3. References to the versions are given *after* the word in question.
4. The following symbols express the relative value of the KQ in the Classifications:

=	K and Q equally satisfactory
כ	Kethib preferable to Qere
ק	Qere preferable to Kethib.
#	K and Q both unsatisfactory.
?	doubtful; refers only to versions enclosed in brackets. E. g. שׂ[פל] means that שׂ (LXX) had the reading definitely; [פל] (Peshitta, Vulgate). doubtfully.

5. The names of Biblical books are abbreviated as follows in the classification and throughout the book:

Gn	בר	Jud	שו	Jer	יר
Ex	שמ	I Sa	שמא	Ez	יח
Lv	וי	II Sa	שמב	Ho	הו
Nu	במ	I Ki	מלא	Joel	יואל
Dt	דב	II Ki	מלב	Am	עמ
Josh	יה	Isa	יש	Ob	עוב

Jonah	יונה	Mal	מל	Ec	קה
Mi	מי	Ps	תה	Est	אס
Na	נחום	Pr	מש	Da	דנ
Hb	חב	Jb	אי	Esra	עז
Zeph	צפ	Ca	שיר	Neh	נח
Hag	חג	Ru	רות	I Ch	דבא
Zc	זכ	La	איכה	II Ch	דבב

6. The names of the Versions are abbreviated as follows:

Sam.	שמ	Samaritan, שומרוני
LXX, G	ש	Septuagint, שבעים
G A	ש^{A}	Alexandrinus, שבעים, כ"י אלכסנדרינוס
G B	ש^{B}	Vaticanus, שבעים, כ"י וטיקאנוס
G Q	ש^{Q}	Marchalianus שבעים, כ"י מרשליאנוס
A	ע	Aquila תרגום יוני של עקילס
Th	ת	Theodotion תרגום יוני של תיאודוציון
S	ס	Symmachus תרגום יוני של סומכוס
P	פ	Peshitta תרגום סורי, פשיטא
V	ל	Vulgate תרגום לטיני ולנטה
O	א	Onkelos אונקלוס
J, T, Tar.	י	Pseudo-Jonathan on Pentateuch תרגום המיוחס ליונתן בן עוזיאל על התורה Targum to Prophets and Hagiographa תרגום יונתן על נ"ך
F	ק	Fragment Targum to Pentateuch תרגום קטעי, הנקרא תרגום ירושלמי על התורה
Alii	נ	The three Greek versions שלשת התרגומים היונים עס"ת

7. Other common abbreviations are:

BDB	Brown-Driver-Briggs, Lexicon of O. T.
eq.	equals
Ges-K	Gesenius-Kautzsch. Hebräische Grammatik (25th ed.)

K	Kethib
Md, מד	Madinchae reading
Maar, מע	Maarbae reading
mg	margin
MI	Mesha Inscription
MT	Masoretic text
om.	omits
Q	Qere
r.	reads
rend.	renders
tr.	translates
vs.	verses
Vss.	Versions

THE ORIGINAL GROUP OF KQ READINGS. (Lists 1–8)

In this entire group, no manuscript variation exists. The Q is merely a guide to the Reader, against blasphemy, indecency or ignorance.

LIST 1

A. GUIDE AGAINST BLASPHEMY

The Tetragrammaton is not pronounced, and the word for "Lord" or "God" takes its place. This instance has been discussed in the body of the treatise.

כתיב	קרי
בכל מקום (ל"ע 6823 פעם) יהוה	אֲדֹנָי, אֱלֹהִים

LIST 2

B. GUIDE AGAINST OBSCENITY

Where the text reads a word which might be too coarse when read in the Synagogue, the Reader is enjoined to substitute one of milder force.

	כתיב	קרי
דב' כח, 27	וּבָעֳפָלִים	וּבַטְּחוֹרִים[1] (שספלאי)
כח, 30	יִשְׁגָּלֶנָּה(ע)	יִשְׁכָּבֶנָּה[2] ([שפלאי?])
שמא' ה, 6	בָּעֳפָלִים	בַּטְּחוֹרִים (עספלי)
ה, 9	עֳפָלִים	טְחוֹרִים (עספלי)
ה, 12	בָּעֳפָלִים	בַּטְּחוֹרִים (עפלי)
ו, 4	עָפְלַי	טְחוֹרַי (פלי)
ו, 5	עָפְלֵיכֶם	טְחוֹרֵיכֶם (לי)
מלב' ו, 25	חֳרֵי יוֹנִים (שפלי)	דִּבְיוֹנִים[3]
י, 27	לְמַחֳרָאוֹת (פ)	לְמוֹצָאוֹת[4] (י?)
יח, 27	חֳרֵיהֶם ([של?])	צוֹאָתָם[4] (י)
שם	שֵׁינֵיהֶם (שפ)	מֵימֵי רַגְלֵיהֶם (י)
יש' יג, 16	תְּשָׁגַלְנָה	תִּשָּׁכַבְנָה (י)
לו, 12	חַרְאֵיהֶם (ש?)	צוֹאָתָם (עסיול?])
שם	שֵׁינֵיהֶם (שפ)	מֵימֵי רַגְלֵיהֶם (עסלי)
יר' ג, 2	שָׁגַלְתְּ (עפ)	שָׁכַבְתְּ (ש?)
זכ' יד, 2	תְּשָׁגַלְנָה (פ?)	תִּשָּׁכַבְנָה (לי)

C. GUIDE AGAINST ERRONEOUS READING (List 3a–8)

LIST 3a

This list contains examples of nouns in the plural with third person masculine singular suffix, written defectiva. To prevent the misreading as a singular, the reader is cautioned by the Q on the margin to read the plural. No variation is here intended. (Against Fürst: Concordance, who takes each K as a singular).

	כתיב	קרי
בר' לג, 4	צוארו	צַוָּארָיו[6]
שמ' כז, 11	ועמדו	וְעַמְדָיו[7]
כח, 28	מטבעתו (ת)	מִטַּבְּעֹתָיו[8] (לפאי)
לב, 19	מידו (פל)	מִיָּדָיו (שאי)
לה, 11	בריחו	בְּרִיחָיו[9]
לט, 33	בריחו	בְּרִיחָיו
וי' ט, 22	ידו	יָדָיו[10]
טז, 21	ידו	יָדָיו[11]
דב' ב, 33	בנו	בָּנָיו[12]
ז, 9	מצותו	מִצְוֹתָיו
ח, 2	מצותו	מִצְוֹתָיו
כז, 10	מצותו	מִצְוֹתָיו[13]
לג, 9	בנו	בָּנָיו[14]
יה' טז, 3	תצאתו	תֹּצְאֹתָיו[15]
שמא' ב, 9	חסידו	חֲסִידָיו[16]
ב, 10	מריבו (ש)	מְרִיבָיו[17] (פלי)
ג, 2	ועינו	וְעֵינָיו[18]
ג, 18	בעינו	בְּעֵינָיו[19]
ח, 3	בדרכו (ש)	בִּדְרָכָיו[20] (לפי)
י, 21	למשפחתו (ש?)	לְמִשְׁפְּחוֹתָיו[21] (לפי)
יח, 7	באלפו	בַּאֲלָפָיו[22]
יח, 14	דרכו	דְּרָכָיו[23]
יח, 22	עבדו	עֲבָדָיו[24]
כא, 12	באלפו	בַּאֲלָפָיו[25]
כא, 12	ברבבתו	בִּרְבָבֹתָיו[25]
כג, 5	ואנשו	וַאֲנָשָׁיו[26]
כט, 5	באלפו	בַּאֲלָפָיו[25]
כט, 5	ברבבתו	בִּרְבָבֹתָיו[25]
ל, 6	בנו	בָּנָיו[27]
שמב' א, 11	בבגדו	בִּבְגָדָיו[28]
יב, 20	שׂמלתו (ניל?)	שִׂמְלֹתָיו[29] (שפ)

	כתיב	קרי
יג, 34	עינו	עֵינָיו[30]
יח, 18	בחיו	בְּחַיָּיו[31]
יט, 19	בעינו	בְּעֵינָיו[19]
כב, 23	משפטו	מִשְׁפָּטָיו[32]
כד, 14	רחמו	רַחֲמָיו[31]
כד, 22	בעינו	בְּעֵינָיו[19]
מלא' ו, 38	משפטו (ש)	מִשְׁפָּטָיו[33]
י, 5	משרתו	מְשָׁרְתָיו[12]
יח, 42	ברכו	בְּרָכָיו[34]
מלב' ד, 34	כפו	כַּפָּיו[12]
יא, 18	מזבחתו	מִזְבְּחֹתָיו[26]
יש' נב, 5	משלו (ש)	מְשָׁלָיו[35]
נו, 10	צפו (ש)	צֹפָיו[36]
יר' יז, 10	כדרכו (ל)	כִּדְרָכָיו
יז, 11	ימו	יָמָיו[37]
טו, 8	אלמנותו	אַלְמְנוֹתָיו[38]
כב, 4	ועבדו	וַעֲבָדָיו[12]
לב, 4	עינו	עֵינָיו[39]
נב, 33	חיו	חַיָּיו[31]
יח' ג, 20	צדקתו (ש^{A}פ)	צִדְקֹתָיו[39a] (ש^{B}לי)
יז, 21	מברחו	מִבְרָחָיו[40]
יח, 21	חטאתו	חַטֹּאתָיו[41]
יח, 24	צדקתו (פ)	צִדְקָתָיו[42]
לא, 5	פארתו	פְּאֵרָתָיו[43]
לג, 16	חטאתו	חַטֹּאתָיו[41]
לג, 13	צדקתו	צִדְקָתָיו[41]
לז, 16	חברו	חֲבֵרָיו[44]
לז, 16	חברו	חֲבֵרָיו[44]
לז, 19	חברו	חֲבֵרָיו[44]
מ, 6	במעלתו	בְּמַעֲלֹתָיו[12]
מ, 9	ואילו (פל)	וְאֵילָיו[45] ([ש?]י)

	כתיב	קרי
מ, 21	ותאו (ש)	וְתָאָיו (ס)
מ, 21	ואילו (ל)	וְאֵילָיו (שעסתי)
מ, 21	ואילמו (סל)	וְאֵילַמָּיו (שעתי)
מ, 22	וחלונו	וְחַלּוֹנָיו
מ, 22	ואילמו (ל)	וְאֵילַמָּיו (שפי)
מ, 22	ותמרו	וְתִמֹרָיו
מ, 22	ואילמו (פל)	וְאֵילַמָּיו (שי)
מ, 24	אילו (ל)	אֵילָיו (שפי)
מ, 24	ואילמו (סל)	וְאֵילַמָּיו (שפי)
מ, 25	ולאילמו	וּלְאֵילַמָּיו
מ, 26	עלותו	עֹלוֹתָיו[45a]
מ, 26	ואילמו (פסל)	וְאֵילַמָּיו
מ, 26	אילו (ל)	אֵילָיו (שי)
מ, 29	ותאו (סל)	וְתָאָיו (שפי)
מ, 29	ואילו (ל)	וְאֵילָיו (שפי[ס?])
מ, 29	ואילמו (ל)	וְאֵילַמָּיו (שפיס)
מ, 29	ולאילמו (סל)	וּלְאֵילַמָּיו (שפי)
מ, 31	ואילמו (שBל)	וְאֵילַמָּיו (פי)
מ, 31	אילו (של)	אֵילָיו (י[ס?])
מ, 31	מעלו (ש)	מַעֲלָיו[45b] (פי[ל?])
מ, 33	ותאו (של)	וְתָאָיו (פי)
מ, 33	ואילו (של)	וְאֵילָיו (פי[ס?])
מ, 33	ואלמו (של)	וְאֵילַמָּיו (פיס)
מ, 33	ולאילמו	וּלְאֵילַמָּיו (שAספיל)
מ, 34	ואילמו (פל)	וְאֵילַמָּיו (שי)
מ, 34	אילו (של)	אֵילָיו (פי)
מ, 34	מעלו (ל?)	מַעֲלָיו (ש[פ?]י)
מ, 36	תאו (ל)	תָּאָיו (שפי)
מ, 36	אילו (ל)	אֵילָיו (שפי)
מ, 36	ואילמו (ל)	וְאֵילַמָּיו (שפי)
מ, 37	ואילו (ל)	וְאֵילָיו (יפ)

	כתיב	קרי
מ, 37	אילו (שׁל)	אֵילָיו (פי)
מ, 37	מעלו (ל?)	מַעֲלָיו (שׁי[פ?])
מג, 11	צורתו (ל, פשׁ)	צוּרָתָיו[46] (יס, פשׁ)
מג, 11	תורתו	תּוֹרָתָיו[46]
מג, 26	ידו (ל)	יָדָיו[12] (פשׁ)
מד, 5	תורתו	תּוֹרָתָיו[47]
מז, 11	בצאתו (שׁ)	בְּצֵאתָיו[48] (פלי)
עמ' ט, 6	מעלותו (שׁל)	מַעֲלוֹתָיו[49] (ספ)
עב' א, 11	שׁערו	שְׁעָרָיו[50]
חב' ג, 14	פרזו	פְּרָזָיו[51]
תה' י, 5	דרכו	דְּרָכָיו[52]
כד, 6	דרשׁו (פ?)	דִּרְשָׁיו[53] (שׁלי)
נח, 8	חצו (שׁס)	חִצָּיו[12] (פי)
קו, 45	חסדו (שׁל)	חֲסָדָיו[6] (פי)
קמז, 19	דברו (שׁעסתפל)	דְּבָרָיו[54] (י)
קמח, 2	צבאו	צְבָאָיו[55]
משׁ' ב, 8	חסידו (שׁ)	חֲסִידָיו[12]
ו, 13	בעינו (שׁ)	בְּעֵינָיו[56]
ו, 13	ברגלו (פשׁ[ל?])	בְּרַגְלָיו[56]
כב, 25	ארחתו	אֹרְחֹתָיו[57]
ל, 10	אדנו	אֲדָנָיו[58]
אי' ה, 18	וידו	וְיָדָיו[59]
יד, 5	חקו (שׁספ)	חָקָיו (לנ?)
טו, 15	בקדשׁו	בְּקָדְשָׁיו[60]
כ, 11	עלומו	עֲלוּמָיו[60a]
כא, 20	עינו	עֵינָיו[61]
כד, 1	וידעו	וְיֹדְעָיו[62]
כו, 14	דרכו (שׁ)	דְּרָכָיו[63] (לפי)
כו, 14	גבורתו (שׁפס)	גְּבוּרֹתָיו[63] (ל)
כז, 15	שרידו	שְׂרִידָיו[64]
לא, 20	חלצו	חֲלָצָיו[65]

	כתיב	קרי
לז, 12	בתחבולתו (עס)	בְּתַחְבוּלוֹתָיו[63] (לפ)
לח, 41	ילדו	יְלָדָיו[66]
לט, 26	כנפו	כְּנָפָיו[67]
לט, 30	ואפרחו	וְאֶפְרֹחָיו[68]
מ, 17	פחדו	פַּחֲדָיו[69]
איכה ג, 25	לקוו (פ?)	לְקֹוָיו[70] (שׁיל)
ג, 39	חטאו (שׁ)	חֲטָאָיו[12] (פלו?)
עז' ג, 3	מכונתו (שׁפ?)	מְכוֹנָתָיו[63] (ל)
ד, 7	כנותו	כְּנוֹתָיו[71]
דנ' יא, 10	ובנו (שׁ)	וּבָנָיו[72]

LIST 3b

This group contains analogous prepositional forms, which use the so-called plural suffixes. The Q here, too, seeks to prevent the reading as a singular suffix.

	כתיב	קרי
יה' ג, 4	ובינו	וּבֵינָיו[73]
ח, 11	בינו	בֵּינָיו
שׁמא' ב, 10	עלו	עָלָיו[74]
כב, 13	אלו	אֵלָיו
כו, 5	סביבתו	סְבִיבֹתָיו
כו, 7	מראשתו	מְרַאשֹׁתָיו
כו, 7	סביבתו	סְבִיבֹתָיו
כו, 11	מראשתו	מְרַאשֹׁתָיו
כו, 16	מראשתו	מְרַאשֹׁתָיו
שׁמב' ב, 23	תחתו	תַּחְתָּיו
ג, 12	תחתו	תַּחְתָּיו
טז, 8	תחתו	תַּחְתָּיו
טז, 8	ועלו	וְעָלָיו
כ, 8	ואחרו	וְאַחֲרָיו
כג, 9	אלו	אֵלָיו

	כתיב	קרי
יח' ט, 4	אלו	אֵלָיו
זכ' ב, 8	אלו	אַלָיו
אי' ט, 13	תחתו	תַּחְתָּיו
רות ג, 14	מרגלותו	מַרְגְּלוֹתָיו

LIST 3c

There are a few nouns in Hebrew, ending in consonantal Vav. Because of the danger that these forms be read with Holem Vav or Surek Vav, the Q writes them with Yod.

	כתיב	קרי
במ' יא, 32	השלו	הַשְׂלָיו
יב, 3	ענו	עָנָיו[75]
תה' קה, 40	שלו	שְׁלָיו
שיר ב, 11	סתו	סְתָיו[76]

LIST 4

This group contains nouns with the older masculine singular ending Holem He. To avert the possibility of their being read Kames He, i. e., as feminine suffixes, the Q writes the later and clearer form, with Vav, on the margin, as a guide to the reader in the absence of vocalization.

	כתיב	קרי
בר' ט, 21	אהלה	אָהֳלוֹ[77]
יב, 8	אהלה	אָהֳלוֹ
יג, 3	אהלה	אָהֳלוֹ
לה, 21	אהלה	אָהֳלוֹ
מט, 11	עירה	עִירוֹ
מט, 11	סותה	סוּתוֹ
שמ' כב, 4	בעירה	בְּעִירוֹ
כב, 26	כסותה	כְּסוּתוֹ
לב, 27	ברעה	בְּרַעוֹ

	כתיב	קרי
וי' כג, 13	ונסכה (ל?)	וְנִסְכּוֹ[79a] (שפאי)
במ' י, 36	ובנחה	וּבְנֻחוֹ
יה' יא, 16	ושפלתה	וּשְׁפַלָתוֹ
טו, 35	שוכה (פ)	שׂוֹכוֹ[78] (שׂגל?])
טו, 48	ושוכה (פש)	וְשׂוֹכוֹ[79] (שׂג)
טו, 50	ואשתמה (ש)	וְאָשְׁתְּמוֹ[80] (פל)
טו, 50	וגלה	וְגִלּוֹ (פ[ג?])
שו' ט, 49	שוכה (שעסת)	שׂוֹכוֹ[81] (פי)
מלב' ו, 10	והזהירה	וְהֻזְהִירוֹ
ט, 25	שלשה	שָׁלְשׁוֹ
יט, 13	קצה	קְצוֹ
כ, 13	נכתה (ש)	נְכֹתוֹ[81a] (פי)
יש' טו, 3	כלה	כְּלוֹ[82]
לט, 2	נכתה	נְכֹתוֹ
יר' ב, 3	תבואתה	תְּבוּאָתוֹ[83]
ב, 21	כלה	כְּלוֹ[84]
ח, 6	כלה	כְּלוֹ
ח, 10	כלה	כְּלוֹ
טו, 10	כלה (פ[ש?])	כְּלוֹ[85] (ע[סת?])
כ, 7	כלה (ש)	כְּלוֹ[85a] (עס)
כב, 18	הדה	הֹדוֹ[85b] (שי)
מח, 31	כלה	כְּלוֹ[86]
מח, 38	כלה	כְּלוֹ[86]
יח' יא, 15	כלה	כְּלוֹ
יב, 14	עזרה	עָזְרוֹ[87]
כ, 40	כלה (ש)	כְּלוֹ[87a] (פי)
לא, 18	המונה	הֲמוֹנוֹ
לב, 31	המונה	הֲמוֹנוֹ
לב, 32	המונה	הֲמוֹנוֹ
לו, 10	כלה (ש)	כְּלוֹ[87a] (פלי)
לט, 11	המונה	הֲמוֹנוֹ

	כתיב	קרי
מח, 15	בתוכה (פ)	בְּתוֹכוֹ[87b] (שלי)
מח, 18	תבואתה (ש)	תְּבוּאָתוֹ[87b] (פלי)
מח, 21	בתוכה (ש)	בְּתוֹכוֹ[87b] (פלי)
הו' יג, 2	כלה (ש)	כְּלוֹ[87a] (לי)
נחום ב, 1	כלה (ש)	כְּלוֹ[87a] (פלי)
חב' א, 9	כלה (ש)	כְּלוֹ[87a] (ספלי)
א, 15	כלה (ש)	כְּלוֹ[87a] (פלי)
ג, 4	עזה	עָזּוֹ
תה' י, 9	בסכה	בְּסָכּוֹ[88]
כז, 5	בסכה (ש^{B}ס)	בְּסָכּוֹ[88a] (עיפש)
מב, 9	שירה (ס)	שִׁירוֹ[88b] (עפלי)
דנ' יא, 10	מעזה (ע)	מָעֻזּוֹ[89] (לת)

LIST 5

In the absence of vocalization, the Kethib לא may be mistaken for the negative לא rather than an alternative spelling for לוֹ. To prevent this error, the Q on the margin writes לוֹ ק'.

	כתיב	קרי
שמב' יח, 12	ולא	וְלוֹ[89a] (ה)
יט, 7	לא	לוֹ

LIST 6

Probably belonging to the same category of doubtful words are the examples in list 6. The orthography of גיים and צביים with two Yods, or the spelling צבאים, makes an error easily possible, which the Q seeks to prevent by writing the more normal and hence less equivocal form on the margin. For similar uses of the KQ terminology in Ochlah v'Ochlah rubrics, and an alternative interpretation of these KQ, see the discussion in Chapter Three.

	כתיב	קרי
בר' י, 19	וצביים	וּצבוֹיִם[99] (ה)
יד, 2	צביים	צָבוֹיִם (ה)
יד, 8	צביים	צָבוֹיִם
כה, 23	גיים	גוֹיִם
דב' כט, 22	צביים	צָבוֹיִם (ה)
הו' יא, 8	כצבאים	כְּצָבוֹיִם (ה)
תה' עט, 10	בגיים	בַּגוֹיִם

LIST 7

Likewise forming part of the guides to the reader, are the instances where the text, in accordance with older orthography, writes only one of two adjoining and identical vowel-letters (including He). This objection to plene writing made itself especially felt before word separation was introduced. Thus מביאת did duty for the later מביא את. In nearly every case, too, there are other vowel letters in the word besides the ones affected by the Q — an additional reason for omitting the doubled letters in the K.

א' חסר

	כתיב	קרי
שמב' ה, 2	והמבי את	וְהַמַּבִיא אָת
מלא' כא, 21	מבי אליך	מַבִיא אַלַיִךְ
מלב' יג, 6	החטי את	הָחֲטִיא אָת
ירי' יט, 15	מבי אל	מַבִיא אָל
לב, 35	החטי את	הַחֲטִיא אָת
לט, 16	מבי את	מַבִיא אָת

ה' חסר

שמב' כא, 9	והמ המתו	וְהַמָּה הָמְתוּ
כג, 9	בשלשה גבורים	בִּשְׁלֹשָׁה הַגִּבּוֹרִים
ירי' י, 13	מקצה ארץ (מד)	מִקְצֵה הָאָרֶץ[91]

ו' חסר

	כתיב	קרי
בר' כז, 29	וישתחו	וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּו[92]
מג, 28	וישתחו	וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּ
שו' כא, 20	ויצו	וַיְצַוּו[93] (שפלי)
מלא' ט, 9	וישתחו	וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוּ
מלב' כ, 18	יקח והיו (שי)	יִקְחוּ וְהָיוּ[94] (פל)
יח' ז, 21	וחללוה והסבתי	וְחִלְלוּהוּ וַהֲסִבֹּתִי[95]

י' חסר

יש' כח, 15	כי עבר	כִּי יַעֲבֹר[96]

LIST 8

At times, even one vowel letter was omitted, especially when others occurred elsewhere in the word. Here, too, the Q notes this fact only at the end of a word, where the danger of an incorrect reading was greatest. In the middle of a word, an omitted vowel-letter elicits merely a note חסר "lacking" in the Masorah marginalis. (See chapter 3).

א' חסר

	כתיב	קרי
בר' כ, 1	מחטו	מֵחֲטֹא[97]
מלא' יב, 12	ויבו (ש?)	וַיָּבֹא[98] (פלי)
כא, 29	אבי	אָבִיא[98]
אי' טו, 31	בשו	בָּשָׁא[99]

ה' חסר

שמ' ד, 2	מזה	מַה זֶּה[100]
יש' ג, 15	מלכם	מַה לָּכֶם[100]
יח' ח, 6	מהם	מָה הֵם[100]
תה' עד, 6	ועת	וְעַתָּה[100a] (סי)
מש' לא, 16	נטע	נָטְעָה[101]

ו' חסר

	כתיב	קרי
במ' ג, 51	הפדים ([שפי?])	הַפְּדוּיִם[102]
שמא' ז, 9	ויעלה	וַיַּעֲלֵהוּ[103]
יב, 10	ויאמר	וַיֹּאמְרוּ[104]
יג, 19	אמר	אָמְרוּ
מלא' יב, 7	וידבר	וַיְדַבְּרוּ
מלב' כב, 5	ויתנה	וַיִּתְּנֻהוּ
אס' ט, 26	וקבל	וְקִבְּלוּ
עז' ג, 3	ויעל (ש)	וַיַּעֲלוּ[105] (פל)

י' חסר

שו' א, 27	ישב (ש[A])	יְשֵׁבִי[106] (ש[B])
מלא' ח, 48	בנית	בָּנִיתִי[107]
מלב' יז, 31	אלה	אֱלֹהַי (לישׁ[A])
יר' ז, 22	הוציא	הוֹצִיאִי
יח' טז, 59	ועשית	וְעָשִׂיתִי[107]
תה' קמ, 13	ידעת	יָדַעְתִּי[108]
אי' מב, 2	ידעת	יָדַעְתִּי

THE LATER GROUPS OF KQ READINGS (Lists 9–85).

This group consists entirely of manuscriptal variants. (For proofs of the inadequacy of the correction theory, the reader is referred to Chapter Two as well as the introductions to the various lists). The *K* is the *text* of the *archetype*; the *Q* contains noteworthy *divergences* of *reliable codices*, based on a very early collation. (Chapter Three). We have endeavored to ascertain the preferable reading in each case, seeking to base our conclusion on a sound and a thorough interpretation of the text in the light of Hebrew grammar and idiom. Where doubt prevailed, the preference was given to the Q. The basis of our decision in each case will be found in the notes to the several passages.

A. ORTHOGRAPHICAL VARIANTS

LIST 9

Division of Words.

This group contains examples where the K (the archetype) and the Q (other manuscripts) divide the consonantal text differently. That we are not dealing with corrections is proved by the much larger number of instances where no KQ occurs and where the textual division is manifestly at fault. Often the versions follow the alternative word-division. We select a handful of examples where no KQ exists:

Proposed Division Versions		Masoretic Division	
(ל, ס, ש)	עֲקַבָם: אָשֵׁר	עָקֵב: מֵאָשֵׁר	בר' מט 19
(ש)	בְּפַר מְשֻׁלָּש	בְּפָרִים שְׁלֹשָׁה	שמא' א, 24
(ת"י, ס, ש)	וּמְשָׁפָטַי כָּאוֹר יֵצֵא	וּמִשְׁפָּטַי אוֹר יֵצֵא	הו' ו, 5
	וְאַחֲרִית הַשִּׁמְחָה	וְאַחֲרִיתָהּ שִׂמְחָה	מש' יד, 13

On the entire subject see Ginsburg's Introduction, chap. 3, and Delitzsch, Schreib-und Lesefehler im A. T., par. 3a many of whose examples, however, are highly doubtful.

	כתיב	קרי	
שמב' ה, 2	הָיִיתָה מוֹצִיא	הָיִיתָ הַמּוֹצִיא	ק
כא, 12	שָׁם הַפִּלְשָׁתִּים	שָׁמָּה פְּלִשְׁתִּים	=
מלא' כ, 33	וַיַּחְלְטוּ הממנו	וַיַּחְלְטוּהָ מִמֶּנּוּ	ק
יח' מב, 9	ומתחתה לְשָׁכוֹת (ש)	וּמִתַּחַת הַלְשָׁכוֹת[109a] (יל)	ק
אי' לח, 12	יְדַעְתָּה שַׁחַר (ש?)	יְדַעְתָּ הַשַּׁחַר[110] (עתי)	כ
עז' ד, 12	וְשׁוֹרֵי אַשְׁכְּלֹלוּ	וְשׁוֹרֵיָא שַׁכְלְלוּ	ק

LIST 10

K, Two Words; Q, One Word

In this group, are included only those examples of KQ which differ, not in the consonants, but in the separation of words. Here, too, no correction is contemplated; witness the large number of similar forms unnoticed by the Q, such as Isa 54:9 and Jer 23:33. For an exhaustive treatment, see Delitzsch op. cit. pars. 5a, b.

	כתיב	קרי	
שמא' ט, 1	מִבֶּן יָמִין	מִבִּנְיָמִין (שלפי)	ק
איכה ד, 3	כי ענים	כַּיְעֲנִים (שספלי)	ק
דבב' לד, 6	בחר בתיהם	בְּחַרְבֹתֵיהֶם[111] (פלי)	#

LIST 11

K, One Word; Q, Two Words

Here, too, corrections are highly improbable, because of the large number of instances unnoticed by the Q. Among the most striking examples, where no KQ occurs, we select the following (see Delitzsch, 4a ff.):

Proposed Reading	Masoretic Text	
וּמִי סָפַר –(ל, ש, שמ)–	וּמִסְפָּר	במ' כג, 10
תֵּבֵל יִתֹּם –(Luzzatto)–	תַּבְלִיתָם	יש' י, 25
הַר כְּמוֹ –(Versions)–	הרכם	תה' יא, 1
אַךְ טוֹב לַיָּשָׁר אֵל	אַךְ טוֹב לְיִשְׂרָאֵל	תה' עג, 1

	כתיב	קרי	
דב' לג, 2	אֶשֶׁדֹת (ש?)	אֵשׁ דָּת[112] (עסתלאיק)	#
יר' ו, 29	מאשתם (פ)	מֵאֵשׁ תָּם[113] (שלי)	ק
תה' י, 10	חֵלְכָאִים (ל?)	חֵל כָּאִים[114] ([שפי?])	ק
סכג, 4	לְנַאֲיוֹנִים (שעסיפל)	לְנַאֵי יוֹנִים[115]	כ

	כתיב	קרי	
אי' לח, 1	מנהסערה	מִן הַסְּעָרָה[116]	ק?
מ, 6	מנסערה	מִן סְעָרָה[116]	ק?
נח' ב, 13	המפרוצים	הֵם פְּרוּצִים[116] (שפל)	ק?
דבא' כז, 12	לַבְּנָיְמִינִי (שני?)	לַבֵּן יְמִינִי (ל)	=

LIST 12

THE DIPHTHONG "AI"

A characteristic of the older orthography was the writing of the "ai" diphthong without a Yod, probably because it was slurred in pronunciation. This may account for ללה (night) and צהרם (noon) on the Mesha Inscription (line 15), as well as such forms as עֲדָנָה and עָדָן (Ecc 4:2, 3) by the side of the Rabbinic though more original form עֲדַיִן.

In view of the known conservatism of place-names, we would expect to find this older orthography frequent among them. This expectation is not disappointed. On the Mesha Inscription we read קריתן (l. 10), בת דבלתן (l. 30), and חורנן (l. 31), corresponding to the Biblical קריתים (Jer 48:1), בית דבלתים (ibid 48:22) and חרנים (ibid 48:34). We find also דָתָן (Gen 37:17) by the side of דֹּתַיְנָה, and קָרְתָן (Josh 21:32) by the side of קִרְיָתַיִם. The KQ supplies several other examples of the unexpressed diphthong:

	כתיב	קרי	
שמב' ג, 3	לאביגל	לַאֲבִיגַיִל[117]	=
יה' י, 1 ועוד	ירושלם	יְרוּשָׁלַיִם[118]	=
מלב' יד, 2	יְהוֹעָדָן	יְהוֹעַדָּיִן[119]	=
יח' כה, 9	וקריתמה	וְקִרְיָתַיְמָה[120]	=
מו, 19	בירכתם	בְּיַרְכָתַיִם	=

B. ARCHAISMS

In these categories the archaic form is usually, though not always, in the K — evidence of the antique character of the archetype. Nevertheless, there are some exceptions, which prove that no corrections were intended. For a fuller discussion of the implications, see Ch. 4, and the individual introductions.

LIST 13

In these examples, the K writes the second person masculine singular pronoun אַת, which the Q changes into the more common form אַתָּה. Nevertheless, three times the defective spelling is left without a KQ, viz. Nu 11:15; Deut 5:24; Ez 28:14. It seems probable that even the K intends the form with the vowel ending: אַתָּ, as both the Aramaic Kethib (אנתה) and the Arabic and Ethiopic cognates end in a vowel. The He supplied by the Q is in reality a means of preserving the word against a misreading as אַתָּ.

כתיב קרי
= שמא' כד, 19, תה' ו, 4, אי' א, 10, קה' ז, 22, נח' ט, 6 וְאַתְּ וְאַתָּה

LIST 14

When an assimilation of a Tav occurs before the pronominal suffix "ta", a He is usually written in order to fill out the form. Thus נָתָתָּה is twice as common as נָתַתָּ. In our example, the Q adds the He to the form in the K.

כתיב קרי
= תה' צ, 8 שַׁתְּ שַׁתָּה

LIST 15

K — אַתִּי AND CORRESPONDING VERB FORMS WITH YOD.

In a number of instances, the older, more original אתי occurs in the K. This is true also of the corresponding second person feminine singular of the perfect (קטלתי). This final Yod was

later discarded, as in Syriac, though kept in the imperfect and before suffixes. (See Ges-K, par. 32, note 4; Stade: Hebraeische Grammatik, p. 253). In these cases, the Q offers the later form, without the Yod. That here too no corrections can be implied is proved by the following instances where no KQ exists: שַׁקַמְתִּי (Jud 5:7) נְתַקְתִּי, שָׁבַרְתִּי (Jer 2:20) and (Micha 4:13) וְהַחֲרַמְתִּי.[122]

	כתיב	קרי	
שו' יז, 2	וְאַתִּי	וְאַתְּ[122a]	=
שם	אָלִיתִי	אָלִית	=
מלא' יד, 2	אַתִּי	אַתְּ	=
מלב' ד, 16	אַתִּי	אַתְּ	=
ד, 23	אַתִּי	אַתְּ	=
ח, 1	אַתִּי	אַתְּ	=
יר' ב, 33	לִמַּדְתִּי	לִמַּדְתְּ[122b]	=
ג, 4	קָרָאתִי	קָרָאת	=
ג, 5	דִּבַּרְתִּי	דִּבַּרְתְּ	=
ד, 19	שָׁמַעְתִּי	שָׁמַעְתְּ[122c] (שפלי)	כ
ד, 30	וְאַתִּי	וְאַתְּ	=
לא, 21	הָלָכְתִּי	הָלָכְתְּ	=
מו, 11	הִרְבֵּיתִי	הִרְבֵּית	=
יח' טז, 13	אָכָלְתִּי	אָכָלְתְּ	=
טז, 18	נָתַתִּי	נָתַתְּ	=
טז, 22	זָכַרְתִּי	זָכַרְתְּ	=
טז, 31	עָשִׂיתִי	עָשִׂית	=
שם	הָיִיתִי	הָיִית	=
טז, 43	זָכַרְתִּי	זָכַרְתְּ	=
שם	עָשִׂיתִי (סל)	עָשִׂית (שפי)	=
טז, 47	עָשִׂיתִי	עָשִׂית[123]	=
טז, 51	עָשִׂיתִי	עָשִׂית	=
לו, 13	אָתִּי	אָתְּ	=
רות ג, 3	וְיָרַדְתִּי	וְיָרַדְתְּ	=
ג, 4	וְשָׁכַבְתִּי	וְשָׁכַבְתְּ	=

LIST 16

K — Older Second Person Feminine Singular Suffix.

This older ending, which exists in Arabic, Ethiopic and Syriac, was preserved in common speech long after it had fallen into disuse among the more cultivated classes. Hence it occurs only in folk dialect (where the Q changes into the later and more normal form) and in passages where an archaic flavor was consciously sought by the author, as for example Ps. 103:3, 4, 5; 116:7 etc. Here too, not all the instances are noted by the Q, because the manuscripts did not have variants at all the passages.

	כתיב		קרי	
מלב'	ד, 2	לָכִי	לָךְ	=
	ד, 3	שָׂכַנְיְכִי	שָׂכַנְיִךְ	=
	ד, 7	נְשָׂיְכִי	נְשָׂיִךְ	=
	שם	בָּנַיְכִי	בָּנַיִךְ	=
שיר	ב, 13	לָכִי (ש)	לָךְ[123] (פלי)	=

LIST 17

K — Paragogic Yod, lacking in Q.

A remnant of the old Semitic case endings, which Hebrew lost at an early stage in its history, exists in the now meaningless paragogic Yod. In the cases noted below, the Q reads without the Yod, though an even larger number of instances is passed over in silence by the Q — proving again no intent to correct, merely manuscript variants. The following are a few passages where the paragogic Yod is allowed to remain in the text: Gen 16:11; 49:11; Ex 15:16; Deut 33:16; Hos 10:11; Zech 11:17 (bis); Ps 113:6, 7, 9. See Ges-K, 90, 3a.

	כתיב	קרי	
מלב' ד, 23	הוֹלַכְתִּי	הוֹלָכֶת	=
יר' י, 17	יוֹשַׁבְתִּי	יוֹשָׁבֶת	=
כב, 23	יוֹשַׁבְתִּי	יוֹשָׁבֶת	=
שם	מְקֻנַּנְתִּי	מְקֻנָּנֶת	=
נא, 13	שׁוֹכַנְתִּי	שׁוֹכָנֶת[123b] (שלפי)	=
יח' כז, 3	הַיוֹשַׁבְתִּי	הַיוֹשָׁבֶת	=
מש' כח, 16	שִׂנְאִי	שִׂנְאֵי[124]	=
איכה ד, 21	יוֹשַׁבְתִּי	יוֹשָׁבֶת	=

LIST 18

K—Archaic third Person Feminine plural of the Perfect

In Aramaic, Arabic and Ethiopic, there is a special form in the perfect for the third person feminine plural, as distinct from the third person masculine plural (*Katalu*, קָטַלוּ). In Ethiopic and Aramaic, the ending is long ā, *Katala* and קָטַלָא. This form once existed in Hebrew as well: קָטַלָה by the side of קָטְלוּ. Perhaps because of its possible confusion with the third person feminine singular form (קָטְלָה) it fell into desuetude, and the masculine form קָטְלוּ became common to both genders. Nevertheless, it occurs at least a score of times. In twelve cases, it is changed by the Q into the masculine form; the other eight instances remain unnoted by the Q. The unchanged passages are:

קמה על בבל מחשבות	יר' נא, 26	בנות צעדה	בר' מט, 22
דלתות העמים נסבה	יח' כו, 2	ועיניו קמה	שמא' ד, 15
כנפי יונה נחפה בכסף	תה' סח, 14	נלכדה קריות וגו'	יר' מח, 41
מניות הלויים לא נתנה	נח' יג, 10	חתתה קשתותם	יר' נא, 56

On this lost form, see the monograph of M. Lambert: Une Série de Qeri-Ketib (Paris 1891). This form has been independently recognized by Gesenius-Kautzsch, Ehrlich, and the writer.

	כתיב	קרי	
במ' לד, 4	וְהָיָה (ק)	וְהָיוּ (איפ)	=
דב' כא, 7	שָׁפְכָה (פ)	שָׁפְכוּ[124a] ([שלא?])	=
יה' טו, 4	וְהָיָה (ש?)	וְהָיוּ[124b] (פלי)	=
יז, 8	וְהָיָה	וְהָיוּ[124c]	=
יח, 12	וְהָיָה	וְהָיוּ	=
יח, 14	וְהָיָה	וְהָיוּ	=
יח, 19	וְהָיָה	וְהָיוּ	=
מלא' כב, 49	נִשְׁבָּרָה	נִשְׁבְּרוּ	=
יר' ב, 15	נִצָּתָה	נִצְּתוּ	=
כב, 6	נוֹשָׁבָה	נוֹשָׁבוּ	=
נ, 6	הָיָה ([שפ?])	הָיוּ	=
תה' עג, 2	שָׁפְכָה (ש)	שָׁפְכוּ[125] (פלי)	=
אי' טז, 16	חָמַרְמָרָה	חָמַרְמְרוּ[125a]	=

LIST 19

Feminine Archaisms.

On this group see notes to the individual passages.

	כתיב	קרי	
מלב' ט, 37	וְהָיָת	וְהָיְתָה[126] (מד)	=
יר' מט, 25	תְּהִלָּה	תְּהִלָּת[127]	כ

LIST 20

K — Older Form of ל״ה Participle Passive Qal.

Corresponding to the Aramaic participle passive of Peal of ל״י verbs, גְּלִי, there are a few sporadic examples in Hebrew of the form עָשׂוּ, where the Q reads the more normal, later form עָשׂוּי. See Barth, Nominalbildung, paragraph 123a; Ges-K 75, 6, Note 1. Even here forms unmodified by the Q occur, as Jb 41:25 (העשו לבלי חת) proving no desire for correction.

	כתיב	קרי	
שמא' כה, 18	עֲשׂוּת	עֲשׂוֹת	=
מלב' כג, 4	הָעֲשׂוּם	הָעֲשׂוֹיִם	=
יש' ג, 16	נְטוּת	נְטוֹת	=
אי' טו, 22	וְצָפוּ	וְצָפוֹי[127]	=

LIST 21

K — Pausal Cohortative Forms.

It is well known to students of Hebrew grammar that the oldest forms of Hebrew verbs are to be found in the uncontracted pausal or suffixed forms. Thus קָטָלוּ which appears in pause as קָטָלוּ and before suffixes as קָטָלוּנִי, is anterior to the now normal form קָטְלוּ which is a violent contraction, probably due to a forward shift in the accent. In the same manner, the cohortative אֶקְטְלָה is a violent contraction of an earlier אֶקְטָלָה due to a change from a penultimate to an ultimate accent. This earlier form of the cohortative, written with Vav in order to preserve the Holem, meets us twice in the K. Each time the Q removes the Vav and vocalizes with Hateph Kames, the later, more usual form. A similarly uncontracted form, unchanged by the Q meets us in Ex 18:26 (יִשְׁפּוּטוּ) and in Ruth 2:8 (תַּעֲבוּרִי).

On the other hand, our textual forms may be writing Vav as a sign for Kames in the absence of vowels. For further details see the introduction to List #31.

	כתיב	קרי	
יש' יח, 4	אָשְׁקוֹטָה	אָשְׁקְטָה[128]	ק?
עז' ח, 25	וְאָשְׁקוֹלָה	וְאָשְׁקְלָה	ק?

LIST 22

K — Older Form of the Imperative.

These forms, like מלוכה in the K, have occasioned no little difficulty. Ges-K 46, 2, 2 merely mentions them together with pausal imperatives like גְּזֹרוּ (I Ki 3:26). Praetorius (Stade's Zeitschrift 1883 p. 55) vocalizes מְלוֹכִי as a secondary imperative on ע"ו analogy, which he correctly calls a very precarious assumption.

It is our opinion that these forms are archaic imperatives that are to be vocalized מְלָכָה, מְלֹכִי, מְלֹכוּ, etc. The following arguments enforce this view:

1. The considerations adduced in the introduction to List 21 would imply that the ordinary imperfect from which the imperative is formed, originally ran as follows: תִּמְלֹךְ, תִּמְלֹכִי, תִּמְלֹכוּ, תִּמְלֹכְנָה etc. This yields an imperative of the type we have postulated, when the prefixed letters are removed. These forms, moreover, coincide with the present pausal forms of the imperative, and are: מְלֹךְ (מְלָכָה), מְלֹכִי, מְלֹכוּ, מְלֹכְנָה.

2. The original form of the imperative of "a" imperfect verbs is שְׁמָעִנִי, שְׁמָעִינִי, שְׁמָעוּנִי etc., going back to the pausal forms of the imperfect תִּשְׁמָע, תִּשְׁמָעִי, תִּשְׁמָעוּ etc. We may safely assume that an analogous practice existed in the case of both ō-imperfect and ā-imperfect verbs.

3. The analogy of other Semitic languages favors our assumption. Aramaic has קְטוֹל, קְטָלִי, קְטָלוּ. (see Strack: Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramaeischen p. 29) and Arabic has *uktul*, *uktuli*, etc., to which the assumed forms are thoroughly cognate.

Hence, we feel that the K forms, as vocalized below, are archaic imperatives.

	כתיב	קרי	
שו' ט, 8	מְלוֹכָה	מָלְכָה	=
ט, 12	מְלוֹכִי	מָלְכִי	=
שמא' כח, 8	קְסוֹמִי	קָסָמִי	=
תה' כו, 2	צְרוֹפָה	צָרָפָה	=

LIST 23

K — אנתה; Q — אנת

Here the K safeguards the original a-ending (אַנְתָּה) common to all Semitic languages. The later contracted form אַנְתְּ is postulated by the Q.

דנ' ב, 29, 31, 37, 38; ג, 10; ד, 15, 19; ה, 13, 18, 22, 23; ו, 17, 21; עז' ז, 25

	כתיב	קרי	
	אַנְתָּה	אַנְתְּ	=

LIST 24

K — Plural Nouns with Yod; Q — omits Yod.

In early Aramaic, when suffixes of the second person masculine, third person feminine, and first person plural were added to masculine plural nouns, they combined with the Yod of the plural to create diphthongal forms, *aich*, *aiha*, and *aina* respectively. Later speech contracted the diphthongs into *ach*, *aha*, and *ana* (see introduction to list 12). Whether manuscriptal variants without the Yod lie at the basis of the K-Q of this group, or whether the Q registers the current Aramaic pronunciation of its time cannot be decided, though the latter alternative seems preferable. This would mean a later date for this group of KQ readings. See Chapter 3, note 56a and the prefatory remarks to list 26; also Strack p. 18, Barth in AJSL, vol. 17, p. 203.

		כתיב	קרי	
דנ'	ב, 4	לְעַבְדַיִךְ	לְעַבְדָךְ	=
	ב, 29	רַעְיוֹנַיִךְ	רַעְיוֹנָךְ	=
	ג, 12	לַאלָהַיִךְ	לַאלָהָךְ	=
	ג, 18	לַאלָהַיִךְ	לַאלָהָךְ	=
	ד, 16	לְשָׁנְאַיִךְ	לְשָׂנְאָךְ	=
	שם	לְעָרַיִךְ	לְעָרָךְ	=
	ד, 24	וַחֲטַיִךְ	וַחֲטָאָךְ	=
	ה, 10	וְזִינַיִךְ	וְזִינָךְ	=
	ה, 23	וְרִבְרְבָנַיִךְ	וְרַבְרְבָנָךְ	=
	ז, 4	גַּפַּיִה	גַּפָּה	=
	ז, 5	שְׁנַיִה	שְׁנָה	=
	ז, 6	גַּבַּיִה	גַּבָּה[129]	=
	ז, 7	בְּרַגְלַיִה	בְּרַגְלָה	=
	ז, 19	שְׁנַיִה	שְׁנָה	=
	שם	וְטִפְרַיִה	וְטִפְרָה	=
	שם	בְּרַגְלַיִה	בְּרַגְלָה	=
עז'	ד, 11	עַבְדַיִךְ	עַבְדָךְ	=
	ז, 18	אַחַיִךְ	אָחָךְ	=

LIST 25

Analogous Prepositions.

Prepositions with plural endings likewise underwent the loss of the diphthong characteristic of the preceding group. See introduction to list 3b.

		כתיב	קרי	
דנ'	ב, 26	הַאִיתַיִךְ	הַאִיתָךְ	=
	ג, 12	עֲלַיִךְ	עָלָךְ	=
	ג, 18	אִיתַיְנָא	אִיתָנָא	=
	ד, 14	עֲלַיִה	עָלָה	=
	ד, 22	עֲלַיִךְ	עָלָךְ	=

	כתיב	קרי	
ד, 24	עֲלַיִךְ	עָלָךְ	=
ד, 29	עֲלַיִךְ	עָלָךְ	=
ה, 14	עֲלַיִךְ	עָלָךְ	=
ה, 16	עֲלַיִךְ	עָלָךְ	=
ה, 21	עֲלַיהּ	עָלָהּ	=
ה, 23	קֶדֶמַיִךְ	קֶדֶמָךְ	=
ו, 14	עֲלַיִךְ	עָלָךְ	=
ו, 23	קֶדֶמַיִךְ	קֶדֶמָךְ	=
ז, 7	קֶדֶמַיהּ	קֶדֶמָהּ	=
ז, 8	קֶדֶמַיהּ	קֶדֶמָהּ	=
ז, 20	קֶדֶמַיהּ	קֶדֶמָהּ	=
עז' ז, 18	עֲלַיִךְ	עָלָךְ	=

C. PHONETIC VARIANTS.

In the following introductory paragraphs, some evidence will be brought forward to make it likely that the variations of this sub-class are later than the main body of variants. In the absence of complete certainty on the subject, we have preferred to include them with the rest.

LIST 26

K — Yod, Q — Aleph between Vowels.

When a Yod occurred between two vowels, it tended to be assimilated to Aleph, especially with gentilics and ordinals. This process was common to Eastern Aramaic, including the idiom of Onkelos, the Babylonian Talmud and the eastern Syrians (see Noeldeke Syriac Grammar 40e), though it was not in vogue in Palestinian Aramaic (Dalman: Grammatik des Palestin. Aram. par. 39, 2.).

That no corrections are implied by these Q needs no proof. The reverse process (Aleph to Yod) also finds expression in the Masorah (see List 27). Moreover, examples like יְהוּדָאִין (Da 3:12), where the "Babylonian" pronunciation is in the text, or קַדְמָיָא (Da 7:24) where the "Palestinian" pronunciation is unchanged by the Q, create a strong presumption that both forms occurred in the manuscripts, irrespective of the dialectic differences which later became so marked. On the other hand it is still possible that we have here guides to the pronunciation, which like groups 24, 25, were compiled at a much later date than the body of true variants.

	כתיב		קרי
שמא' כב, 18	דּוֹגָ	=	דּוֹאֵג (שפיל?)
שם	לְדוֹגָ	=	לְדוֹאֵג (שפלי?)
כב, 22	דּוֹגָ	=	דּוֹאֵג (שפלי?)
מלב' יא, 4, 9, 10, 15	הַמַּאוֹת	=	הַמַּאוֹת[130]
דנ' ב, 5	לְכַשְׂדָיֵא	=	לְכַשְׂדָאֵי
ב, 10	לְכַשְׂדָיֵא	=	לְכַשְׂדָאֵי
ב, 39	תְּלִיתָיָא	=	תְּלִיתָאָה
ב, 40	רְבִיעָיָא	=	רְבִיעָאָה
ג, 3	תִּפְתָיֵא	=	תִּפְתָאֵי
ג, 25	רְבִיעָיָא	=	רְבִיעָאָה
ג, 26	עִלַּיָא	=	עִלָּאָה
ג, 32	עִלַּיָא	=	עִלָּאָה
ד, 4	כַּשְׂדָיֵא	=	כַּשְׂדָאֵי
ד, 14	עִלַּיָא	=	עִלָּאָה
ד, 21	עִלַּיָא	=	עִלָּאָה
ד, 22	עִלַּיָא	=	עִלָּאָה
ד, 29	עִלַּיָא	=	עִלָּאָה
ד, 31	עִלַּיָא	=	עִלָּאָה
ה, 7	כַּשְׂדָיֵא	=	כַּשְׂדָאֵי
ה, 18	עִלַּיָא	=	עִלָּאָה

		כתיב	קרי	
	ה, 21	עִלַּיָא	עִלָּאָה	=
	ה, 30	כַּשְׂדָיָא	כַּשְׂדָאָה	=
	ו, 1	מָדַיָא	מָדָאָה	=
	ו, 29	פַּרְסַיָא	פַּרְסָאָה	=
	ז, 7	רְבִיעָיָא	רְבִיעָאָה	=
	ז, 23	רְבִיעָיָא	רְבִיעָאָה	=
	ז, 25	עִלַּיָא	עִלָּאָה	=
עז'	ה, 12	כַּסְדָיָא	כַּסְדָאָה	=
	ו, 16	וְלַוַיָא	וְלַוָאֵי	=
	ו, 17	לְחַטָיָא	לְחַטָאָה	=
	ו, 18	וְלַוַיָא	וְלַוָאֵי	=
	ז, 13	וְלַוַיָא	וְלַוָאֵי	=
	ז, 24	וְלַוַיָא	וְלַוָאֵי	=

LIST 27

K — Aleph, Q — Yod between Vowels

This group is the reverse of the preceding.

		כתיב	קרי	
יח'	יד, 14	דָּנֵאל	דָּנִיֵאל[131]	=
	יד, 20	דָּנֵאל	דָּנִיֵאל	=
	כח, 3	מְדָנֵאל	מְדָנִיֵאל	=
דנ'	ב, 38	דָּאֲרִין	דָּיְרִין	=
	ג, 3	וְקָאֲמִין	וְקָיְמִין	=
	ג, 31	דָּאֲרִין	דָּיְרִין	=
	ד, 32	דָּאֲרִי	דָּיְרִי	=
שם		וְדָאֲרִי	וְדָיְרִי	=
	ה, 19	זָאֲעִין	זָיְעִין	=
	ו, 26	דָּאֲרִין	דָּיְרִין	=
	ו, 27	זָאֲעִין	זָיְעִין	=

	כתיב	קרי	
עז' ה, 1	נְבִיאָה	נְבִיאָה[131a] (וׁשפל?)	=
ו, 14	נְבִיאָה	נְבִיָא	=
ז, 25	דָאֲנִין	דָיְנִין	=

LIST 28

K — Vav, Q — Yod between Vowels.

A Vav between vowels has a tendency to change to Yod. This accounts for the appearance of a Yod in the Piel of ע"ו verbs, as e. g. קִיֵּם as well as for a group of KQ.

	כתיב	קרי	
שמא' יח, 9	עוֹן	עוֹיֵן[132]	=
יש' ל, 6	עֲוָרִים	עֲיָרִים	ק
יר' טז, 16	דַּוָּגִים	דַיָּגִים[133]	=
עז' ד, 9	דַּהֲוָא (וׁשB[ל?])	דַּהֲיָא[133a] (וׁשAפ)	=

LIST 29

K — Yod, Q — Vav between Vowels.

	כתיב	קרי	
אי' ו, 2	וְהַיְתִי	וְהַוְתִי[134]	ק

LIST 30

K — Holem, Q — Kames Hatuph before Makkeph.

In these instances, the loss of the accent caused by the insertion of the Makkeph, entailed the reduction of the vowel from Holem to Kames Hatuph (See Ges-K 10, 3). Here too, the Q cannot be earlier than the invention of the vocalic system when the Makkeph was introduced. Whenever plene writing occurred,

a KQ became necessary. Yet in Ex 21:37; Jos 18:20, no change is called for by the Q.

In one case that we have included in this group, the normal imperfect יָגִיל is changed into יָגֵל resembling the jussive. (Cf. however, Driver: Hebrew Tenses par. 70 and references there). This may be caused by the heavy "prefix" מַה (So Driver) or by a recession of the accent before מְאֹד (So Gesenius and Ewald).

	כתיב	קרי	
יה' ט, 7	אֲכִרוֹת	אֲכָרַת–	=
שמא' כב, 15	לִשְׁאוֹל	לִשְׁאָל–	=
כה, 31	וְלִשְׁפּוֹךְ	וְלִשְׁפָּךְ–	=
יש' כו, 20	יַעֲבוֹר	יַעֲבָר–	=
מד, 17	יִסְגּוֹד	יִסְגָּד–	=
יר' ה, 7	אֲסִלּוֹחַ	אֲסִלַּח–[135]	=
לג, 8	לְכוֹל	לְכָל–[136]	=
יח' כא, 28	כִּקְסוֹם	כִּקְסָם–	=
כד, 2	כְּתוֹב	כְּתָב–	=
מד, 3	לֶאֱכוֹל	לֶאֱכָל–	=
הו' ח, 12	אֶכְתּוֹב	אֶכְתָּב–	=
נחום א, 3	וּגְדוֹל	וּגְדָל–	=
ב, 1	לַעֲבוֹר	לַעֲבָר–	=
תה' כא, 2	יָגִיל	יָגֵל–	=
פט, 29	אֶשְׁמוֹר	אֶשְׁמָר–	=
קמה, 8	וּגְדוֹל	וּגְדָל–	=
מש' כב, 2	יְקְצוֹר	יְקְצָר–	=
כב, 11	טְהוֹר	טְהָר–	=
כב, 14	יְפוֹל	יְפָל–	=
רות ד, 6	לְגָאוֹל	לְגָאָל–	=
דבא' יח, 10	לִשְׁאוֹל	לִשְׁאָל–	=
דבב' לו, 14	לְמָעוֹל	לְמָעָל–	=

LIST 31

K — Holem, Q — Kames Hatuph.

A category analogous to the preceding. A Holem is reduced to a Kames Hatuph when it loses the accent for any reason whatsoever. See Ges-K 10, 3. As the notes will make plain the change is uncalled for in a large number of instances. Even where the reduction is called for, the Vav may be merely a guide to the reader in the absence of vocalization as is common in Mishnic orthography, as e. g. לגונבו equivalent to לְגָנְבוֹ. Similarly the ספר חסידים (ed. מקיצי נרדמים p. 184) insists that the Siddur be always written plene to prevent error, as for example קודשך, עובדך for קָדְשְׁךָ etc. See A. Ziphroni in the Sepher Ha-Shanah p. 130.

	כתיב	קרי	
דב' לב, 13	בָּמוֹתַי	בָּמֳתַי[137]	ק?
יש' נח, 14	בָּמוֹתַי	בָּמֳתַי	ק?
מי' א, 3	בָּמוֹתַי	בָּמֳתֵי	ק?
יח' כז, 15	וְהוֹבְנִים	וְהָבְנִים[138]	=
תה' לח, 21	רדופי	רָדֳפַי[139]	=
קא, 5	מְלוֹשְׁנִי	מְלָשְׁנִי[140]	כ
נח' יג, 23	אַשְׁדּוֹדִיוֹת	אַשְׁדֳּדִיוֹת[141]	=
שם	עַמּוֹנִיוֹת	עַמֳּנִיוֹת[142]	=
דבא' ז, 34	וְרוֹהֲגָה (ל?)	וְרָהֲגָה (י?)	=
דבב' לא, 12	כּוֹנְנָיְהוּ	כָּנְנָיָהוּ[142a] (י)	=
לא, 13	כּוֹנְנָיְהוּ	כָּנְנָיָהוּ[142a]	=
לד, 22	תּוֹקְהַת (שׂ^A)	תָּקְהַת (לי)	=
לה, 9	וְכוֹנְנָיְהוּ	וְכָנְנָיָהוּ (י)	=
ח, 18	אוֹנְיוֹת	אֳנִיוֹת[143]	ק

LIST 32

Assimilation.

This class contains examples where He and the Nun of מן are assimilated. Correction is out of the question, as the K forms are all possible and in one case preferable to the Q.

	כתיב	קרי	
שמא' כד, 9	מִן הַמְעָרָה	מֵהַמְעָרָה[144]	כ?
מלב' ז, 12	בְּהַשָּׂדֶה	בַּשָּׂדֶה[145]	=
ט, 15	לַגַּיד (מד)	לְהַגִּיד[146]	=
איכה א, 6	מִרבַּת	מְרַבַּת[147]	=

LIST 33

Metathesis.

The category includes instances where consonants have been transposed not through a scribal error, but in the actual language (see notes). They are therefore as admissible as כָּבָשׁ and כָּשָׁב. שַׂלְמָה and שַׂמְלָה.

	כתיב	קרי	
שו' טז, 26	וְהֵימִשֵּׁנִי	וַהֲמִישֵׁנִי[148]	=
שמב' כ, 14	וַיִּקְלְהוּ	וַיְקַלְּהוּ[149]	=
יר' טו, 4	לְזִוָּעָה	לְזַעֲוָה[150]	=
כד, 9	לְזִוָּעָה (ועס?)	לְזַעֲוָה[150a]	=
כט, 18	לְזִוָּעָה	לְזַעֲוָה	=
לד, 17	לְזִוָּעָה	לְזַעֲוָה	=
עז' ד, 4	וּמְבַלְּהִים (פ?)	וּמְבַהֲלִים[151] (ל)	=
דבב' כט, 8	לְזִוָּעָה	לְזַעֲוָה	≠

D. MORPHOLOGY OF NOUNS

LIST 34

K — Pa'ul, Q — Pa'il Form.

The normal form of the participle passive Qal in Hebrew is קָטוּל. The קָטִיל form, normal in Aramaic, is almost completely restricted in Hebrew to substantives. See Barth: op. cit. 123a, 126c. However, purely participial forms sometimes do exist, as בְּלִי מָשִׁיחַ בַּשָּׁמֶן, כְּתִית (II Sa 1:21) and the Q forms of our group. This fluctuation between pa'ul and pa'il must have been considerable, as we find the reverse in List #35.

Moreover, each form of the participle has nouns similarly constructed, with vocalic assimilation (Sheva under the first radical). Their relationship to the participles is complicated. See Barth, 29a, b, 82e and Ges-K, 84a, 8, 9, 12.

	כתיב	קרי	
בר' לט, 20	אֲסוּרֵי	אֲסִירֵי	=
במ' כו, 9	קְרוּאֵי	קְרִיאֵי	=
שו' ז, 13	צָלוּל	צְלִיל[152]	=
מלא' ו, 5	יָצוּעַ	יָצִיעַ[153]	כ?
יש' סב, 3	וּצְנוּף	וְצָנִיף	ק?
יר' יד, 3	צְעוּרֵיהֶם	צְעִירֵיהֶם[154]	ק?
יד, 14	וְאֻלוּל	וְאֱלִיל	ק?
יח, 15	שְׁבוּלַי	שְׁבִילַי[154a] (עס)	ק
יח, 16	שְׁרוּקַת	שְׂרִיקַת[155]	=
מג, 10	שַׁפְרוּרוֹ	שַׁפְרִירוֹ	=
מח, 4	צְעוּרֶיהָ	צְעִירֶיהָ[155] (עס)	ק?
יח' ד, 15	צְפוּעֵי	צְפִיעֵי[156]	=
מא, 15	וַאֲתוּקֵיהָא	וַאֲתִיקֵיהָא[157]	ק?
נחום ב, 6	בַּהֲלוּכָתָם (שׁ^Aלפ)	בַּהֲלִיכָתָם[158] (שׁ^B)	ק?

	כתיב	קרי	
זכ' יא, 2	הַבָּצוּר ([פל?])	הַבָּצִיר[159] (י?)	כ
אס' ח, 13	עֲתוּדִים	עֲתִידִים[160]	=
עז' ח, 15	הַנְּתוּנִים (פ)	הַנְּתִינִים[161] (ל)	כ
דבא' כד, 24	שָׁמוּר	שָׁמִיר (שלי)	=

LIST 35

K — Pa'il, Q — Pa'ul Form.

This category is the reverse of the preceding. The K has the "Aramaic" form which the Q changes. Also, nouns of the same form, with vocalic assimilation, occur in this group. See the preceding introduction. A few similar, though not identical, variations in the morphology of nouns have been included such as *pe'il*, *pa'il* in the K against *pe'ol*, *pa'ul* in the Q.

	כתיב	קרי	
בר' לו, 5	יְעִישׁ	יְעוּשׁ (שפלאי)	=
לו, 14	יְעִישׁ	יְעוּשׁ (שפלאי)	=
במ' א, 16	קְרִיאֵי	קְרוּאֵי[162]	=
שו' טז, 21	הָאֲסִירִים	הָאֲסוּרִים[162]	=
טז, 25	הָאֲסִירִים	הָאֲסוּרִים	=
מלא' ו, 21	בְּרַתִּיקוֹת	בְּרַתּוּקוֹת[163]	=
טז, 34	וּבִשְׁגִיב	וּבִשְׁגוּב[164] (שפלי)	ק
מלב' כג, 36	זְבִידָה (פל)	זְבוּדָה[165] (י)	=
ישע' י, 13	וַעֲתוּדֹתֵיהֶם	וַעֲתִידוֹתֵיהֶם[166] (ש?)	=
כג, 13	בַּחִינָיו	בַּחוּנָיו[167]	=
מט, 6	וְנִצִירֵי	וְנִצוּרֵי	=
יר' לז, 4	הַכְּלִיא	הַכְּלוּא[168]	=
מח, 7	כְּמִישׁ	כְּמוּשׁ (שפלי)	ק
נב, 31	הַכְּלִיא	הַכְּלוּא	=

	כתיב	קרי	
הו' ו, 10	שַׁעֲרִירָיָה	שַׁעֲרוּרָיָה[169]	=
תה' יז, 14	וּצְפִינְךָ	וּצְפוּנְךָ[170]	=?
קה' ה, 10	רָאִית	רָאוּת[167] (תס)	=
דנ' ב, 22	וּנְהִירָא	וּנְהוֹרָא[171]	ק
דבא' ז, 10	יְעִישׁ	יְעוּשׁ[171a] (שפלי)	=
ט, 33	פְּטִירִים	פְּטוּרִים	=?

LIST 36

Names

It has been pointed out that Hebrew prefers the so-called genitive ending (i) while Aramaic prefers the nominative (u) in such nouns as אב, אח, and חָם. Thus אֲבִיהוּ in Hebrew and אֲבוּהוּ in Aramaic. In the case of proper nouns utilizing these elements, however, both forms are utilized in Hebrew, though some of these examples may be due to textual error.

	כתיב	קרי	
שמא' כה, 18	אֲבוּנַיִל	אֲבִינַיִל (שפלי)	=
מלב' כד, 18	חֲמִיטַל (שBAל)	חֲמוּטַל[172] (פי)	=
יר' נב, 1	חֲמִיטַל (שBAל)	חֲמוּטַל (פי)	=
דבא' ח, 25	וּפְנִיאֵל (שB)	וּפְנוּאֵל[173] (שAלי)	=
ט, 35	יְעוּאֵל (פ)	יְעִיאֵל (שלי)	=?
יא, 44	וְיעוּאֵל	וְיעִיאֵל (ש)	=?
יב, 3	וְיזוּאֵל	וְיזִיאֵל (מד) (שAלי)	=?
דבב' כו, 11	יְעוּאֵל	יְעִיאֵל (שלי)	=?
כט, 13	וְיעוּאֵל	וְיעִיאֵל (שלי)	=?
כט, 14	יְחוּאֵל	יְחִיאֵל (שלי)	=?

LIST 37

Gentilic Nouns.

K preserves the uncontracted double Yod forms of gentilic nouns, while the Q offers a shorter contracted form. That we are not dealing with corrections but with manuscript variations, is proved by the appearance of contracted as well as uncontracted forms in the text. See notes to the individual passages.

	כתיב	קרי	
יש' כג, 12	כִּתִּיִּים (מד)	כִּתִּים[174]	=
יח' כג, 14	כַּשְׂדִּיִּים	כַּשְׂדִּים	=
אס' ד, 7	בַּיְהוּדִיִּים	בַּיְהוּדִים	=
ח, 1	הַיְהוּדִיִּים	הַיְהוּדִים	=
ח, 7	בַּיְהוּדִיִּים	בַּיְהוּדִים	=
ח, 13	הַיְהוּדִיִּים	הַיְהוּדִים	=
ט, 15	הַיְהוּדִיִּים	הַיְהוּדִים	=
ט, 18	הַיְהוּדִיִּים	הַיְהוּדִים	=
נח' ד, 7	בַּצְחִיִּים	בַּצְחִיחִים[175]	ק
דבא' א, 11	לוּדִיִּים	לוּדִים	=
יד, 10	פְּלִשְׁתִּיִּים	פְּלִשְׁתִּים	=
דבב' כו, 7	הָעַרְבִיִּים	הָעַרְבִים	=
לו, 17	כַּשְׂדִּיִּים	כַּשְׂדִּים	=

LIST 38

נער—נערה

The variation in these forms may be, as has been suggested, merely orthographical. According to this view, the word was pronounced *na'ara*, even when the final He was not added, cf. שַׁתָּ, אַתָּ. Another view assumes an epicene origin where *na'ar* was originally both masculine and feminine. (Cf. *ho pais*,

das Kind, child) and only later was the feminine form differentiated. So Hiller, op. cit. p. 276; Buxtorf, Tiberias p. 124. See Ges-K 2, 5 note 1. The fact that the Samaritan Pentateuch always writes נערה proves nothing but the unreliability of this text, as we have had occasion to show previously. (Against BDB s. v. נערה).

כתיב קרי

בר' כד, 14, 16, 28, 55, 57; לד, 3, 12 נַעַר או נַעֲרָה (כ') נַעֲרָה (ק')=
דב' כב, 15, 16, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29.

LIST 39

עניים—ענוים Group.

That we are dealing only with variations is proved by the fact that K and Q reverse each other in different examples. It has been maintained that עָנָו and עָנִי are distinct forms, the former meaning "humble, meek," the latter meaning "humbled" as a passive. See Lagarde, Bildung der Nomina p. 48, Rahlfs: ענו–עני in den Psalmen p. 67 ff., Driver: art. Poor, in Hastings Dictionary of the Bible. BDB maintains that there is no clear-cut difference in their use. Though a structural difference may be conceded, there seems to be no perceptible difference in the use and meaning of עני and ענו in the plural, at least.

	כתיב	קרי	
יש' לב, 7	עֲנָוִים	עֲנִיִּים	=
עמ' ח, 4	עַנְוֵי	עֲנִיֵּי	=
חה' ט, 13	עֲנִיִּים	עֲנָוִים	=
ט, 19	עֲנָוִים	עֲנִיִּים	=
י, 12	עֲנִיִּים	עֲנָוִים	=
מש' ג, 34	וְלָעֲנִיִּים	וְלָעֲנָוִים	=
יד, 21	עֲנִיִּים	עֲנָוִים	=
טז, 19	עֲנִיִּים (פ)	עֲנָוִים[175a]	=

LIST 40

שׁוב שׁבות

This idiom has caused a great deal of difficulty. For a discussion of its meaning see E. Preuschen: "Ueber die Bedeutung von *shub shebuth*" in ZATW, XV, 1895, p. 1 ff. and Schwally, ZATW 1888, p. 200. We are interested in the idiom linguistically. There is first of all a variation in the use of the verb, both Kal and Hiphil being used. The Kal of שׁוב is intransitive normally, and is here given a transitive force because of alliteration. An analogous example where an intransitive becomes transitive is furnished by Isa 2:21 לַעֲרוֹץ הָאָרֶץ. The Kal is generally used in the perfect (וְשָׁב וגו׳); the Hiphil, in the imperfect (אָשִׁיב). (See Ehrlich on Deut 30:8). In addition, there is a variation between שׁבות and שׁבית, which will occasion no surprise after lists number 34 and 35. Among the roots suggested for the noun have been שׁבה (Gesenius, Preuschen, et al.), שׁוב (Ewald, Olshausen, Kuenen) and שׁבת (Ehrlich).

Through a study of the KQ examples of this idiom, we arrive at the following conclusions:

1. When the perfect of the verb (Kal) is used, either שׁבית (Ps 126:4) or שׁבות (Jer 29:14) appears in the Q—hence no correction is involved.
2. When a verb form with ī (as Hiphil imperfect) is used then the *Q always* prefers the "u" form of the noun: אשׁיב שׁבות never אשׁיב שׁבית. When a "u" form of the verb is used, the Q has an ī form of the noun שׁובה שׁביתני. In other words, the Q, but not the K, manifests a distaste for two ī sounds or ū sounds in succession. Yet even here the Q is not a correction, but rather the reading of a manuscriptal group. Thus in Zeph 3:20, two ū sounds

occur with no Q: בשובי את שבותכם. Similar instances are Hos 6:11; Ps 14:7; 53:7.

3. The same conclusion, that the Q is a variant, and not a correction is borne out by Jer 49:39, where the K אָשׁוּב אֶת שְׁבִית is changed by the Q into אָשִׁיב אֶת שְׁבוּת, though there is no cacophony present.

4. The tendency of the Q may originally have arisen as a correction in ms. texts; it entered the KQ corpus purely as variations. See our comment in Chapter 2, note 18.

	כתיב		קרי
יר' כט, 14	שְׁבִיתְכֶם	=	שְׁבוּתְכֶם
לג, 26	אָשׁוּב	=	אָשִׁיב
מט, 39	אָשׁוּב . . . שְׁבִית	=	אָשִׁיב . . . שְׁבוּת
יח' טז, 53	שְׁבִית . . . וּשְׁבִית וּשְׁבִית	=	שְׁבוּת . . . וּשְׁבוּת וּשְׁבוּת
לט, 25	שְׁבִית	=	שְׁבוּת
יואל ד, 1	אָשׁוּב	=	אָשִׁיב
צפ' ב, 7	שְׁבוּתָם	=	שְׁבִיתָם
תה' פה, 2	שְׁבוּת	=	שְׁבִית
קכו, 4	שְׁבוּתֵנוּ	=	שְׁבִיתֵנוּ
אי' מב, 10	שְׁבִית	=	שְׁבוּת
איכה ב, 14	שְׁבִיתֵךְ	=	שְׁבוּתֵךְ

LIST 41

Synonyms.

See notes to individual passages.

	כתיב		קרי
שמא' כ, 24	עַל	=	אֶל[177] (מד)
יש' ל, 5	הַבָּאִישׁ	=	הוֹבִישׁ[178]
סה, 7	על (י?)	=	אֶל[177] (ש?)
יר' א, 5	אֲצוּרֵךְ ([שפ?])	=	אָצָרֵךְ[179] ([לי?])

	כתיב	קרי	
מש' כ, 21	מִבַּחֲלָת	מִבְּהָלָת[180]	כ
אי' כא, 13	יְבַלּוּ (ל)	יְכַלּוּ[181] (שפי)	=
שיר א, 17	רָהִיטֵנוּ	רַהִיטֵנוּ[182]	=
דנ' ט, 24	וְלַחְתֹּם (ת)	וּלְהָתֵם[182a] (עפל)	=

LIST 42

Miscellaneous Variations in Nouns.

This group contains examples where closely similar forms of the same word appear in the KQ. Usually both forms are equally justifiable. See notes for details.

	כתיב	קרי	
בר' כז, 3	צֵידָה	צַיִד[183]	=
שמ' לז, 8	קִצּוֹתָיו	קְצוֹתָיו[184]	=
לט, 4	קִצּוֹתָיו	קְצוֹתָיו	=
יה' ב, 13	אֲחוֹתַי	אַחְיוֹתַי[185] (ש)	=
כא, 10	רְאִישָׁנָה	רִאשֹׁנָה[186]	=
שו' יא, 37	וְרַעְיֹתָי	וְרֵעוֹתָי[187]	=
יג, 18	פָּלְאִי	פִּלְיִ[188]	כ
שמא' כ, 38	הַחַצִי	הַחֲצִים[189] (שעסתלפי)	=?
שמב' ג, 25	מְבוֹאָךְ	מוֹבָאֲךְ[190]	כ?
יד, 19	אִשׁ (שליופ?ן)	אִישׁ[191]	כ
כג, 20	הָאַרְיֵה	הָאֲרִי	=
מלא' ו, 16	מְיַרְכוֹתַי	מִירְכֹתַי[192]	ק?
ז, 23	וְקָוָה (ש)	וְקָו[193]	=
כ, 41	מַעַל	מֵעָלַי[194]	כ
מלב' ב, 16	הַגֵּיאוֹת	הַגֵּיאָוֹת[195]	=
ה, 25	מֵאָן	מֵאַיִן[196]	=
יש' נד, 16	הַן	הִנֵּה[197]	=
יר' יד, 14	וְתַרְמוּת	וְתַרְמִית[198]	=
יז, 13	יְסוּרַי (של)	וְסוּרַי[199] (פסי)	=

	כתיב	קרי	
יח, 3	וְהִנָּהוּ	וְהִנֵּה הוּא[200] (שׂ?)	=
יח, 10	הָרָעָה	הָרָע[201]	=
יט, 2	הַחֲרָסוֹת	הַחַרְסִית[202] (שׂעסת)	=
כו, 6	הַזֹּאתָה	הַזֹּאת[203]	ק
לא, 39	קְוָה	קַו[204]	=
לז, 19	וְאַיּוֹ	וְאַיֵּה[205] (שׂפלי)	=
מב, 6	אֲנוּ (מד)	אֲנַחְנוּ[206]	=
מח, 7	יַחַד	יַחְדָּיו[207]	=
נ, 15	אֲשִׁיוֹתָיהָ	אָשְׁיוֹתָיהָ[208]	=
יח' ד, 6	הַיְמִינִי	הַיָּמָנִי[209]	=
ו, 3	וְלַגְּאוֹת	וְלַגְּאוֹת[195]	=
טז, 13	שֵׁשִׁי (מד)	שֵׁשׁ[210]	=?
כט, 4	חֲחִיִּים	חַחִים[211] (מד)	ק?
לד, 25	בַּיְעוֹרִים	בַּיְעָרִים ([שׂלי?])	ק
מג, 15	וּמַהָאַרְאֵיל (פ?)	וּמֵהָאֲרִיאֵל[212] (שׂנל?])	=
מג, 16	וְהָאַרְאֵיל (פ?)	וְהָאֲרִיאֵל[212] (שׂנל?])	=
הו' ט, 16	בְּלִי	בַּל[213] (מד)	=
מי' ג, 2	רָעָה	רָע[201]	=
זכ' א, 4	וּמַעֲלִילֵיכֶם (שׂ)	וּמַעֲלֵלֵיכֶם[214] (פלי)	=
א, 16	וְקָוָה	וְקָו[204]	=
תה' צב, 16	עֹלָתָה	עוֹלָתָה[215]	=
קלט, 6	פְּלִאָיָה	פְּלִיאָה[216]	כ
מש' א, 27	שַׁאֲוָה	שׁוֹאָה[217] (שׂי)	ק
ג, 15	מִפְּנִיִּים	מִפְּנִינִים[218] ([שׂפלי?])	ק?
ג, 28	לְרֵעֶיהָ	לְרֵעֵהָ[219]	=
ו, 14	מְדוֹנִים	מְדָנִים[220]	=
יח, 19	וּמְדוֹנִים	וּמִדְיָנִים[220] (מד)	=
כ, 20	בְּאִישׁוֹן (שׂ)	בָּאֶשׁוּן[222]	כ
כא, 9	מְדוֹנִים	מִדְיָנִים (מד)	=
כא, 19	מְדוֹנִים	מִדְיָנִים (מד)	=
כג, 29	מְדוֹנִים	מִדְיָנִים	=

	כתיב	קרי	
כה, 24	מְדוֹנִים	מִדְיָנִים (מד)	=
כו, 21	מְדוֹנִים	מִדְיָנִים	=
כז, 15	מְדוֹנִים	מִדְיָנִים	=
כז, 10	וְרַעָה	וְרַעַ[221]	=
כז, 20	וַאֲבַדָה	וַאֲבַדוֹן[223]	=
לא, 18	בַּלַיִל	בַּלַיְלָה[224]	=
אי' ז, 1	עַל	עֲלֵי[225]	=
רות ג, 14	בְּטָרוֹם	בְּטָרֶם[226]	ק
איכה א, 11	מַחֲמוּדַיהָם	מַחֲמַדֵיהֶם[227]	=
ב, 19	בַּלַיִל	בַּלַיְלָה[224]	=
ג, 10	אַרְיֵה	אֲרִי	=
ד, 3	תַּנִין	תַּנִּים[228] (שספלי)	=
אס' ט, 19	הַפְּרוּזִים (שפ)	הַפְּרָזִים[229] (י)	כ
דנ' א, 4	מְאוּם	מוּם[230] (שתלפ)	=?
ג, 5	קִיתָרוֹס	קַתְרוֹס[231]	כ?
ג, 7	קִיתָרוֹס	קַתְרוֹס	כ?
ג, 10	קִיתָרוֹס	קַתְרוֹס	כ?
ג, 15	קִיתָרוֹס	קַתְרוֹס	כ?
ג, 10	וְסִיפַנְיָא	וְסוּפַנְיָא[232] (ל?)	=
ג, 21	פַּטִישֵׁיהוֹן	פַּטְשֵׁיהוֹן[233]	=
ד, 13	אֱנוֹשָׁא	אֱנָשָׁא[234]	ק?
ד, 14	אֱנוֹשָׁא	אֱנָשָׁא	ק?
ד, 16	מָרְאִי	מָרֵי[235]	=
ד, 21	מָרְאִי	מָרֵי	=
ה, 7	וְהַמְנָכָא	וְהַמְנִיכָא[236]	=
ה, 16	וְהַמְנָכָא	וְהַמְנִיכָא	=
ה, 29	וְהַמְנָכָא	וְהַמְנִיכָא	=
ז, 10	רִבְוָן	רִבְבָן[237]	=
עז' ד, 12	וּבְאִישְׁתָא	וּבִישְׁתָא[239]	=
ה, 15	אֲלָה	אֵל[240]	כ
ז, 26	לְשָׁרְשׁוּ	לְשָׁרְשִׁי[241]	=

	כתיב	קרי	
נח' ג, 30	אַחֲרַי	אַחֲרָיו[242] (שפל)	=
ג, 31	אַחֲרַי	אַחֲרָיו[242] (שפל)	=
דבא' יב, 15	גְּדִיתָיו	גְּדוֹתָיו[238]	=
דבב' ג, 17	הַיְמִינִי	הַיָּמָנִי[209]	=
כו, 21	הַחָפְשׁוּת	הַחָפְשִׁית[198]	=

E. MORPHOLOGY OF VERBS

LIST 43

K, VERBS TERTIAE-ALEPH, Q — TERTIAE-HE.

This class contains examples of verbs used as tertiae-Aleph in the K, and tertiae-He in the Q. In Mishnic Hebrew and in Aramaic the tertiae-He (Yod) forms absorbed the Aleph-class almost entirely, but the reciprocal influence of these two groups upon each other must have been strong at all periods in the history of the Hebrew language. For examples of tertiae-Aleph verbs on tertiae-He analogy, see Ges-K p. 214, par. 75, notes VI, c.

	כתיב	קרי	
שמב' יא, 24	וַיִּרְאוּ הַמּוֹרְאִים	וַיִּרוּ הַמּוֹרִים[243]	=
נח' ה, 7	נִשְׂאִים (פ)	נִשִּׂים[244] (שׁל)	=
ו, 8	בּוֹרְאָם	בּוֹרְדָם[245]	=

LIST 44

K — VERBS TERTIAE-HE; Q — TERTIAE-ALEPH.

The reverse of the preceding. For examples of tertiae-He verbs on tertiae-Aleph analogy, see Ges.-K p. 215, note 22. Mishnic examples are: מְנָאן, עֲשָׂאוּם etc.

	כתיב	קרי	
שמב' כא, 12	תָּלוּם	תְּלָאוּם[246]	כ

LIST 45

K — Verbs secundae-Vav; Q — secundae-Yod.

This category contains secundae-Vav verb forms in the K, changed by the Q into secundae-Yod verbs. On the relationship between these two groups see Noeldeke in ZDMG, 1883, p. 537, who maintains that certain secundae-Yod verbs, at least, are essentially and originally Yod, and cannot be included in the group. Yet such examples as חיל and חול (see Mic 4:10 חוּלִי), לון and לין, שים and שום, make it certain that an unusually close relationship between the two classes exists. See Ges-K 73, 2 and notes. These forms are merely manuscript variations, as is evident from the reversed lists 47 and 48.

	כתיב	קרי	
שו' כא, 22	לָרוֹב	לָרִיב[247]	=
שמא' יח, 6	לָשׁוּר	לָשִׁיר[248]	ק?
שמב' יד, 7	שׂוּם	שִׂים	=
מש' ג, 30	תָּרוֹב	תָּרִיב[247]	=
כג, 24	גּוֹל יָגוּל	נִיל יָגִיל[249]	ק?

LIST 46

Similar Nouns.

See introduction to list 45.

	כתיב	קרי	
שמב' ג, 15	לוּשׁ	לָיִשׁ (שA ע פלי)	ק
מלב' כד, 15	אוּלַי	אֵילַי[250]	ק?
יש' נז, 19	נוֹב (ושתל?)	נִיב[251]	=
יר' ו, 7	בּוֹר	בַּיִר[252]	כ
ח, 7	וְסוּס	וְסִיס[253] (מד)	כ
יח' כב, 18	לְסוּג	לְסִיג[254] (שספלי)	ק
תה' עד, 11	חוֹקֵק	חַיְקֵק[255] (שספ)	כ

LIST 47

K — Verbs secundae-Yod; Q — secundae-Vav.

This list is the reverse of number 45. See introduction there.

	כתיב	קרי	
שמב' יג, 32	שִׂימָה	שׂוֹמָה	=
יש' י, 6	וְלִשְׂימוֹ	וְלִשְׂומוֹ	=
יח' ל, 16	תָּחִיל	תָּחוּל[256]	=

LIST 48

Similar Nouns.

This list is the reverse of #46.

	כתיב	קרי	
יש' כח, 15	שַׂיִט	שׂוֹט[257] (פעסח)	ק
יר' יח, 22	שִׂיחָה (ש)	שׂוּחָה[258]	=
תה' מט, 15	וְצִירָם	וְצוּרָם[259] (שעסופל?)	=
עא, 12	חִישָׂה	חוּשָׂה[260]	=
מש' כג, 31	בַּכִּיס	בַּכּוֹס (שפס)	ק
אי' ז, 5	וְגִישׁ	וְגוּשׁ[261]	=

LIST 49

Primae-Yod Verb Forms.

Verbs which occur with primae-Yod in the Qal perfect, are currently divided into three distinct groups: a) originally primae-Vav b) genuinely primae-Yod (Ges.-K par 69, 70) and c) a group with assimilated Yod (Ges.-K par. 71). It is maintained that the original primae-Vav verbs are much more numerous than the primae-Yod class.

Yet this view is inherently difficult and creates too sharp a division between the groups. First, we find many KQ forms of so-called "primae-Vav" verbs in Hiphil and Hophal, with a Yod, where the current view would expect only Vav. To treat them all as textual errors is summary and unnecessary. Second, it is a priori unlikely that Hebrew possessed only *eight* original primae-Yod verbs (Ges.-K, 70, 2). What is more, *five* of these eight show forms on primae-Vav analogy, which makes it plausible to assume that other so-called "primae-Vav" verbs are really "primae-Yods" with primae-Vav forms.

We therefore believe that analogy has been much more at work in these verbs than has usually been recognized. Each group possesses formations based on the analogy of the other, so that at times it is difficult to establish which are the original and which the secondary forms. A mere statistical count of forms in the Bible, or a superficial reference to cognate parallels, often leads one astray in determining the true root, as is pointed out in footnotes 266, 268.

It seems likely that beside the usually accepted genuine primae-Yods, the following verbs also belong to the same class, or preserve analogous forms—ילך, ילל, יסד, יפע, ישב, ידע, יסך(?), יצק, יצא. The grounds for our view will be found in the notes which are here of fundamental importance. A critical re-examination of the etymologies of these words and a wary acceptance of parallels from other languages are essential, if the true nature of these examples is to be understood.

	כתיב	קרי	
בר' ח, 17	הוֹצֵא	הַיְצֵא[263]	=
מלב' ד, 5	מֵיצָקֶת	מוֹצָקֶת[264]	=
טז, 18	מֵיסַךְ	מוֹסַךְ[265] (שפל)	#
יש' יב, 5	מְיֻדָּעַת	מוּדַעַת[266]	=
מה, 2	אוֹשֵׁר	אָיַשֵּׁר[267]	=

	כתיב	קרי	
יר' מח, 18	יְשָׁבִי	וּשְׁבִי[268] (שפלי)	=
מח, 21	מוֹפָעַת (ש)	מֵיפָעַת[269] (פלי)	ק'
נ, 8	יְצֵאוּ	צֵאוּ[270] ([פלי?])	=
יח' לה, 9	תַּישַׁבְנָה (שפלי)	תָּשׁוֹבְנָה[271]	כ
מא, 8	מַיסְדוֹת (י)	מוֹסְדוֹת[272] ([לס?])	ק?
מי' א, 8	שַׁיְלָל	שׁוֹלָל[273] ([שלי?])	כ
תה' ה, 9	הוֹשַׁר	הַיְשַׁר[274]	=
מש' לא, 27	הִילְכוֹת	הֲלִיכוֹת[275]	=?
רות ב, 1	מַיְדַע	מוֹדַע[266]	=

LIST 50

K, APOCOPATED; Q FULL FORM OF TERTIAE-HE VERBS.

Both forms are possible as the reversed list #51 proves. See Driver: Hebrew Tenses par. 66–71 and our notes to the individual passages.

	כתיב	קרי	
יה' כד, 3	וָאָרֵב	וַאֲרַבָּה	=
מלא' א, 37	יְהִי	יִהְיֶה[276]	=
יש' מא, 23	וְנִרָא	וְנִרְאָה	=
יר' מ, 16	תַּעַשׂ	תַּעֲשֶׂה	=
יח' יח, 14	וַיִּרָא (של)	וַיִּרְאֶה[276a]	=
אי' מב, 16	וַיִּרָא	וַיִּרְאֶה	=

LIST 51

K FULL FORM; Q APOCOPATED FORM OF VERBS TERTIAE-HE.

	כתיב	קרי	
יה' ז, 21	וָאָרְאָה	וָאֵרָא[277]	=
יר' ג, 7	וַתִּרְאָה	וַתֵּרָא	=
תה' נא, 4	הַרְבֵּה (שסנ?])	הָרֵב[278] (פ)	=
רות א, 8	יַעֲשֶׂה	יַעַשׂ	=

LIST 52

K WITH; Q WITHOUT HE COHORTATIVE.

It is possible, though hardly probable, that these are cases where the final He is omitted orthographically. The reverse list, 53, shows that we are dealing with optional forms.

	כתיב	קרי	
יח' כג, 16	וַתַּעְנֵב	וַתַּעְנֵבָה	=
חג' א, 8	וְאָכְבֵד	וְאֶכְבְּדָה	=
רות ד, 4	וְאֵדָע	וְאֵדְעָה	=
איכה ה, 1	הַבִּיט	הַבִּיטָה[279]	=
ה, 21	וְנָשׁוּב	וְנָשׁוּבָה	=

LIST 53

K WITHOUT; Q WITH HE COHORTATIVE.

	כתיב	קרי	
יה' כד, 8	וָאָבִיאָה	וָאָבִיא[277]	=
דנ' ט, 18	פְּקָחָה	פְּקַח	=

LIST 54

K REGULAR (PAUSAL) FORM; Q "JUSSIVE" WITH VAV CONSECUTIVE.

See introduction to list #21 on the pausal forms as original. The Q gives the so-called jussive forms, that is, where the recession of the accent has brought about a form similar to the jussive mood. See Driver: Hebrew Tenses par. 69 ff.

	כתיב	קרי	
שמב' יג, ח	וַתָּלוּשׁ	וַתָּלָשׁ	=
יח' יח, 28	וַיָּשׁוֹב	וַיָּשָׁב[280]	=
נח' ד, 9	וַנָּשׁוּב	וַנָּשָׁב	=

LIST 55

KQ, IN THE SAME CONJUGATION, BUT VARYING IN TENSE AND MOOD.

	כתיב	קרי	
יה' ו, 9	תָּקְעוּ (ש)	תִּקְעֲי[281]	ק
ו, 13	הוֹלַךְ	הָלוֹךְ[282]	=
טו, 63	יוּכְלוּ	יָכְלוּ[283] (לי)	=
מלא' יז, 14	תִּתֵּן	תַּת[284] (ש?)	=
יש' לז, 30	וְאָכוֹל	וְאִכְלוּ[285] ([שפלי?])	=
מב, 20	רָאִיתָ ([שפס?])	רָאוֹת[286]	כ
מז, 13	הברו	הִבְרֲי[287] (שפלי)	ק
יר' ט, 7	שׁוֹחֵט (שליא)	שָׁחוּט[288] (פ?)	=
יז, 23	שׁוֹמֵעַ	שָׁמוּעַ[289]	ק?
מי' א, 10	הִתְפַּלַּשְׁתִּי	הִתְפַּלָּשִׁי[290] (שפלי)	=
תה' עג, 2	נְטוּי	נָטְיוּ[291] (שפלי)	=
קיט, 79	וַיֵּדְעוּ	וְיֹדְעֵי (שפלי)	=
מש' ח, 35	מֹצְאִי (שפ)	מָצָא[292] (עסת)	כ?
דנ' יא, 39	הַכִּיר (ל)	יַכִּיר ([שפ?])	=
עז' י, 44	נְשֵׂאִי	נָשְׂאוּ (שפל)	=
דבא' ב, 55	יִשְׁבֵי	יָשְׁבוּ (של)	כ
כה, 1	הַנְּבִיאִים	הַנִּבְּאִים[293] (שסלי)	=

LIST 56

KQ, IN DIFFERENT CONJUGATIONS WITH IDENTICAL MEANINGS.

	כתיב	קרי	
שמ' טז, 2	וַיַּלִּינוּ	וַיָּלִינוּ	=
טז, 7	תַּלִּונוּ	תָּלִינוּ	=
במ' יד, 36	וַיַּלִּונוּ	וַיָּלִינוּ	=
טז, 11	תַּלִּונוּ	תָּלִינוּ	=

	כתיב	קרי	
כא, 32	וַיֵּירַשׁ	וַיִּוָּרֶשׁ[294]	=
לב, 7	תְּנוּאוּן	תְּנִיאוּן[295]	=
שמא' יג, 8	וַיֶּחָל	וַיִּוָּחֶל[296]	=
כז, 4	יוֹסֵף	יָסֵף[297]	=
שמב' ג, 2	וְיֶלְדוּ	וַיִּוָּלְדוּ[298]	=
כ, 5	וַיֵּיחַר	וַיִּוָּחַר[299]	=
כא, 6	יְנָתַן	יְתַּן[300] (ש)	=
כב, 8	וַתִּגְעַשׁ	וַיִּתְגָּעַשׁ[301]	כ
מלב' ז, 15	בְּהֵחָפְזָם	בְּחָפְזָם[302]	=
יא, 2	הַמְמוֹתָתִים	הַמּוּמָתִים[303]	=
יב, 12	הַפְּקֻדִים	הַמְפֻקָּדִים	=
יד, 6	יָמוּת (ושפי?)	יוּמָת[304]	=
יר' לד, 11	וַיַּכְבִּישׁוּם	וַיִּכְבְּשׁוּם	=?
תה' עב, 17	יְנִין	יִנּוֹן[306]	כ
מש' יז, 13	חָמִישׁ	חָמוּשׁ[307]	=
איכה ב, 13	אֲעִוּדֵךְ	אֲעִידֵךְ[308]	ק
דנ' ב, 9	הַזְמִנְתּוּן	הַזְדַּמַּנְתּוּן	=
דבב' לד, 25	וַיְקַטְּרוּ	וַיַּקְטִירוּ[309]	=

LIST 57

KQ in different Conjugations with Differences in Meaning.

	כתיב	קרי	
שו' ז, 21	וַיָּנִיסוּ	וַיָּנוּסוּ[310] (שפלי)	כ
שמב' טו, 20	אָנוּעַ	אָנִיעַ (שפלי)	ק
יח, 3	לַעֲזִיר	לַעֲזוֹר[311] (ושפ?לי)	ק
יר' מח, 44	הניס	הַנָּס (מד, שפלי)	ק
נ, 44	אָרוּצֵם	אָרִיצֵם[312] (שפלי)	ק
יח' לו, 14	תַּכְשִׁלִי	תְּשַׁכְּלִי[313] (שפלי)	=?
מח, 14	יַעֲבוֹר (שול?)	יַעֲבִיר[314] (פו?)	=

	כתיב	קרי	
תה' נד, 7	יָשׁוּב (י)	יָשִׁיב[315] (שלספ)	כ
נו, 7	יַצְפִּינוּ	יִצְפְּנוּ[316] (שפלי)	כ
נט, 16	יְנוּעוּן (לפיעס)	יְנִיעוּן[317]	כ
סו, 7	יָרִימוּ	יָרוֹמּוּ[318] (שסי[ל?])	ק?
עג, 10	יָשִׁיב (של)	יָשׁוּב[319] (שפלי)	כ?
עז, 12	אַזְכִּיר	אָזְכּוֹר[320] ([שסלי?])	=
פט, 18	תָּרִים (י)	תָּרוּם[321] (שפל)	=
קמ, 11	יָמִיטוּ	יִמּוֹטוּ[322] (שפי)	ק
מש' ד, 16	יִכְשׁוֹלוּ	יַכְשִׁילוּ[323] (לי)	ק
יב, 14	יָשׁוּב (שגל)	יָשִׁיב[324]	כ
יט, 16	יוּמָת (לפ)	יָמוּת[325] (י)	ק?
כג, 5	הַתָּעוּף	הַתָּעִיף[326] (שלפי)	כ
אי' כד, 6	יַקְצִירוּ	יְקַצְּרוּ[327] (שלי)	ק
איכה ג, 20	וְתָשְׁיח (שס)	וְתָשׁוֹחַ[328]	=
דנ' ה, 21	שְׁוִי ([לפח?])	שַׁוִּיו[329]	כ
ח, 11	הַרִים (שלפ)	הָרַם[329a] (ת)	ק?
דבב' לה, 4	וְהִכּוֹנוּ (שפי)	וְהָכִינוּ[321a]	כ

LIST 58

KQ, Noun and Verb.

In these examples, the KQ differ, one using a noun and the other a verb of the same root. The preferable form is indicated in each case.

	כתיב	קרי	
יש' מב, 24	לַמְשׁוֹסָה	לִמְשִׁיסָה[322a] ([שפ?])	כ
יח' לה, 12	שְׁמָמָה	שָׁמֵמוּ[323a] (שפל)	ק?
מב, 9	הַמָּבוֹא (שפלי)	הַמַּבִּיא[324a]	כ
מש' כ, 30	תַּמְרִיק (ספלי)	תַּמְרוּק[325a]	=
אי' לג, 21	וּשְׁפִי (פ)	וְשָׁפוּ[326a] (שיל)	=

LIST 59

K UNCONTRACTED, Q CONTRACTED FORMS OF עלל IN BIB. ARAM.

	כתיב	קרי	
דנ' ד, 4	עֲלִלִין	עָלִין[327a]	=
ה, 8	עֲלִלִין	עָלִין	=
ה, 10	עַלְלַת	עַלַּת	=

LIST 60

MISCELLANEOUS VARIATIONS IN VERB FORMS.

	כתיב	קרי	
בר' כד, 33	וַיְיִשָּׂם (פש)	וַיּוּשַׂם[328a] (לאי)	=
שו' יט, 21	וַיְבוֹל	וַיָּבָל[329a]	=
שמא' י, 7	תְּבַאֲיֵנָה	תָּבֹאנָה[330]	=
יח, 1	וַיֵּאֲהֲבוֹ	וַיֶּאֱהַבֵהוּ	=
מלא' ב, 24	וַיּוֹשִׁיבֵינִי	וַיּוֹשִׁיבֻנִי[332]	=
יר' לה, 13	וַהֲבִאוֹתִי	וְהַבֵאתִי[333]	=
אס' ד, 4	וַתְּבוֹאֲיֵנָה	וַתָּבֹאנָה[334]	=
דבא' טו, 24	מַחְצַצְרִים	מַחְצְרִים	=
דבב' ה, 12	מַחְצַצְרִים	מַחְצְרִים	=
ה, 13	לַמַּחְצַצְרִים	לַמַּחְצְרִים	=
ז, 6	מַחְצַצְרִים	מַחְצְרִים	=
יג, 14	מַחְצַצְרִים	מַחְצְרִים	=
כט, 28	מַחְצַצְרִים	מַחְצְרִים	=

F. VARIATIONS IN AGREEMENT.

LIST 61

VARIATIONS IN SINGULAR AND PLURAL.

	כתיב	קרי	
שו' יג, 17	דְּבָרֶיךָ (י)	דְּבָרְךָ[336] (מד, שפל)	=
שמא' כד, 5	אֹיְבֶיךָ	אֹיְבְךָ[337] (שפלי)	ק?
שמב' א, 16	דָּמֶיךָ	דָּמְךָ[338]	=

		כתיב	קרי	
	יח, 8	נְפוּצוֹת (י?)	נָפוֹצֶת[339] (של)	ק?
	כא, 4	לִי	לָנוּ[340] (שפלי)	ק
מלא'	א, 27	עַבְדָיִךְ	עַבְדֶךָ[341] (שפלי)	=
	ח, 26	דְּבָרֶיךָ (לי)	דְּבָרְךָ[336] (שפ)	=
	טז, 26	וּבְחַטֹּאתָיו (שפלי)	וּבְחַטָּאתוֹ[342]	=?
	יח, 36	וּבִדְבָרֶיךָ	וּבִדְבָרְךָ[336] (פלי)	=
	כב, 13	דְּבָרֶיךָ (ש)	דְּבָרְךָ[336] (ספל[י?])	=
מלב'	יב, 12	יַד (ל?)	יְדֵי[343] (ש[י?])	=
	כג, 10	בְּנַי	בָּן[344] (שליפסת)	ק
יש'	כו, 20	דְּלָתֶיךָ (לפ)	דַּלְתְּךָ[345] (ש)	כ
יר'	ח, 6	בְּמִרְצוֹתָם	בִּמְרוּצָתָם[346] (ש[ל]פ?])	=?
	טו, 16	דְּבָרֶיךָ	דְּבָרְךָ[336] (שעספלי)	=
	לב, 23	וּבְתוֹרָתְךָ (ש)	וּבְתוֹרָתְךָ[347] (עפלי)	=
יח'	ט, 5	עֵינֵיכֶם (שפי)	עֵינֵיכֶם[348]	ק
	טז, 20	מִתַּזְנוּתַךְ (לפ)	מִתַּזְנוּתָיִךְ[349]	=
	טז, 25	תַּזְנוּתַךְ (שפ)	תַּזְנוּתַיִךְ[349] (לי)	=
	טז, 51	אֲחוֹתַךְ	אֲחוֹתַיִךְ[350] (שפלי)	=
	לו, 13	גּוֹיַךְ (שלי[פ?])	גּוֹיַיִךְ[351]	=
	לו, 14	וְגוֹיַךְ (שליפ)	וְגוֹיַיִךְ[351]	=
	לו, 15	וְגוֹיַךְ (שלי)	וְגוֹיַיִךְ	=
תה'	עז, 20	שְׁבִילֵיךְ (שלפ)	שְׁבִילֵךְ[352] (י)	=
	קה, 18	רַגְלָיו (שלפי)	רַגְלוֹ	=
	קה, 28	דְּבָרָיו (שעל)	דְּבָרוֹ[336] (פי)	=
	קיט, 147	לְדִבָרֶיךָ (שסל)	לְדִבְרְךָ[336] (פי)	=
	קיט, 161	וּמִדְּבָרֶיךָ (של)	וּמִדְּבָרְךָ[336] (פי)	=
	קכט, 3	לְמַעֲנוֹתָם ([ש]ל?])	לְמַעֲנִיתָם[353] (פי)	כ?
	קמה, 6	וּגְדוּלָתֶיךָ (ע)	וּגְדוּלָתְךָ[354] (שתפלי)	=
מש'	ג, 27	יָדֶיךָ (פ)	יָדְךָ[355] (שי)	=
	ו, 16	תּוֹעֲבוֹת (עת)	תּוֹעֲבַת[356] (שס)	כ
	טז, 27	שְׂפָתָיו (שיל)	שְׂפָתוֹ[357]	=
	כא, 29	דְּרָכָיו (שפ)	דַּרְכּוֹ[358] (לי)	=

	כתיב	קרי	
כד, 17	אֹיְבֶיךָ	אֹיְבְךָ[337] (שסף)	ק?
כו, 24	בִּשְׂפָתוֹ	בִּשְׂפָתָיו[357] (שפלי)	=
שיר ב, 14	וּמַרְאַיִךְ	וּמַרְאֵךְ[359] (ל)	=
רות ג, 3	שִׂמְלָתַךְ (ש?)	שִׂמְלָתַיִךְ[360] (פלי)	=
קה' ד, 8	עֵינָיו (ל)	עֵינוֹ[361] (שפי)	=
ד, 17	רַגְלָיִךְ	רַגְלֵךְ (שפלי)	=
יא, 9	וּבְמַרְאַי (י?)	וּבְמַרְאֵהּ[359] (שפל)	=
דנ' ג, 27	בְּגָשְׁמֵיהוֹן (ל?ת)	בְּגָשְׁמְהוֹן[362] (שפ)	=
ג, 28	גָּשְׁמַיהוֹן (ל?)	גָּשְׁמְהוֹן[362]	=
ט, 12	דְּבָרָיו (שתפל)	דְּבָרוֹ[336]	=
ט, 24	חַטָּאוֹת (שתפ)	חַטָּאת[363] (על)	ק?
עז' י, 12	כִּדְבָרֶיךָ (פ?)	כִּדְבָרְךָ[336] (של)	=
נח' יב, 46	רֹאשׁ (ש)	רָאשֵׁי[364] (ל)	=
דבב' יח, 33	יָדָיִךְ	יָדֵךְ[365] ([שפל])	כ

LIST 62

Variations in Number where a construct Relation governs a Verb.

	כתיב	קרי	
תה' קמ, 10	יְכַסּוּמוֹ	יְכַסֵּימוֹ[366] ([של?]פי)	כ
דנ' ג, 19	אִשְׁתַּנּוֹ	אִשְׁתַּנִּי[366] ([שפל?])	=

LIST 63

Variations in Number because of different Agreements.

	כתיב	קרי	
יה' ט, 7	וַיֹּאמְרוּ (שפול?)	וַיֹּאמֶר[367]	=
מלא' יב, 3	וַיָּבֹאוּ	וַיָּבֹא[368] (ש[A]עפלי)	=
מלב' כד, 10	עָלָה (ש)	עָלוּ[369] (פלי)	=
יח' לו, 22	יְהִיָה (שפינל?)	יְהִיוּ[370]	=
מז, 12	וְהָיוּ (פי)	וְהָיָה[371] (של)	=?

LIST 64

Variations in the Gender of Nouns.

	כתיב	קרי	
שמב' יז, 12	בְּאַחַת	בְּאַחַד[372]	=
כג, 8	אָחָד	אָחָת[373]	ק?
מלא' יט, 4	אָחַת	אָחָד[374]	ק?
יר' ב, 24	נַפְשׁוֹ (פ?)	נַפְשָׁהּ[375] (שלי)	כ?
טו, 9	בָּאָה	בָּא[376] (לי)	=
יז, 24	בָּהּ	בּוֹ[377]	=
מח, 27	נִמְצָאָה	נִמְצָא[378] (פ)	=
יח' ז, 2	אַרְבַּעַת	אַרְבַּע[379]	=?
מה, 3	חָמֵשׁ	חֲמִשָּׁה[380]	ק
מש' ל, 18	וְאַרְבַּע (פי)	וְאַרְבָּעָה[381]	ק?
שיר ד, 9	בְּאַחַד	בְּאַחַת[382]	=?
דבא' כט, 16	הִיא (י)	הוּא[383] (ל?)	=?

LIST 65

Variations in Gender because of different Agreements.

	כתיב	קרי	
שו' יט, 3	לַהֲשִׁיבוֹ (ש)	לַהֲשִׁיבָהּ[384] (מד,שפלי)	כ
מלא' יז, 15	הוּא (ש^{A}ל)	הִיא[385] (ש^{B}פי)	=
יז, 15	וְהִיא (ש^{A}ל)	וְהוּא (ש^{B}פי)	=
מלב' כא, 12	שִׁמְעָיו (מד, י)	שִׁמְעָהּ[386] (פ)	=
יש' ל, 32	בָּהּ (שפ)	בָּם[387] (לי)	כ
ל, 33	הוּא	הִיא[388] (תפלי)	כ
סו, 17	אַחַד (ופל?)	אַחַת[389] (י?)	=
תה' עג, 16	הִיא	הוּא[390] (פ)	=
אי' לא, 11	הוּא	הִיא[391] (פי)	=
שם	וְהִיא (פ)	וְהוּא (י)	=
איכה ד, 17	עוֹדֵינָה (מד, י?)	עוֹדֵינוּ[392] (שפל)	כ
קה' ה, 8	הִיא	הוּא[393] (שפסו?)	=

LIST 66

Variations in Person because of different Agreements.

	כתיב	קרי	
שמב' יד, 22	עַבְדּוֹ (שפי)	עַבְדֶּךָ[394] (ל)	כ
יש' מו, 11	עָצָתִי	עָצָתְי[395] (שפלי)	=

LIST 67

Variations in Person, Number and Gender, mainly *Rhetorical.*

In this group there are variations, mainly in person but also in gender and number due to rhetorical causes.

A. The prophet, in the fire of his discourse, imperceptibly passes over from his words to the words of the Deity speaking through him, and speaks of God in the first person.

B. The prophet draws a picture in which a people is personified, and addresses it in the singular, and then passes from the singular to the plural with great rapidity.

C. The Psalmist implores God's help for himself (in the singular) or for the group of which he is a member (using the plural).

D. A few changes in person are purely exegetical.

E. At times we meet a change from direct to indirect address.

F. Rarely, the author identifies himself with the subject of his discourse changing from third to first person. See the notes in detail.

	כתיב	קרי	
יה' ה, 1	עָבְרַנוּ	עָבְרָם[396] (שפי)	=
שמב' יב, 9	בְּעֵינָו (שחפי)	בְּעֵינַי[397] (על)	כ
כב, 33	דַּרְכּוֹ	דַּרְכִּי[398] (שפלי)	#
כב, 34	רַגְלָיו	רַגְלַי[399] (שפלי)	=

	כתיב	קרי	
יש' טז, 3	הָבִיאוּ (עתו?)]	הָבִיאִי[400] (פשל)	=
שם	עֲשׂוּ (י?)	עֲשִׂי (שפל)	=
יר' ב, 27	יְלִדְתָּנִי (שפל)	יְלִדְתָּנוּ[401] (י?)	=
ג, 19	תִּקְרְאוּ (שפ)	תִּקְרְאִי (ל)	=
שם	תָּשׁוּבוּ (שפ)	תָּשׁוּבִי (ל)	=
ה, 25	תַּצְאִי	תַּצְאוּ[402] (שפלי)	כ
שם	תֵּלְכִי	תֵּלְכוּ (שפלי)	כ
יג, 20	וּרְאִי (ש)	וּרְאוּ[403] (פלי)	ק?
שם	שָׂאִי (ש)	שָׂאוּ (פלי)	ק?
כא, 12	מַעֲלֵלֵיכֶם	מַעֲלֵלֵיהֶם[404] (י)	=
כג, 18	דְּבָרִי (ש)	דְּבָרוֹ[405] (שפלי)	=
מח, 20	הֵילִילִי (ש)	הֵילִילוּ (פלי)	=
שם	וּזְעָקִי (ש)	וּזְעָקוּ (פלי)	=
מט, 30	עֲלֵיהֶם (פ)	עֲלֵיכֶם[406] (שלי)	=
נ, 11	תִּשְׂמְחִי	תִּשְׂמְחוּ[407] (שעספלי)	=
שם	תַּעֲלְזִי	תַּעֲלְזוּ (שפלי)	=
שם	תָּפוּשִׁי	תָּפוּשׁוּ (שפלי)	=
שם	וְתִצְהֲלִי	וְתִצְהֲלוּ (שעספלי)	=
נא, 34	אֲכָלָנִי	אֲכָלַנְיָ[407a] (שעפלי)	=
שם	הֲמָמָנִי	הֲמָמַנְיָ ([ש?]פלי)	=
שם	הִצִּיגָנִי	הִצִּיגַנְיָ (שפלי)	=
שם	בִּלָּעָנִי	בִּלָּעַנְיָ (שפלי)	=
שם	הֲדִיחָנִי	הֲדִיחַנְיָ (שפלי)	=
יח' לב, 34	חִתִּיתוֹ (שBפ)	חִתִּיתִי (סל)	=
תה' יא, 1	נוּדוּ	נוּדִי (שעפלי)	ק?
טז, 10	חֲסִידֶיךָ	חֲסִידֶיךָ (שלי)	=
יז, 11	סְבָבוּנִי (שספל)	סְבָבוּנִיָ[410] (י)	=
ס, 7	וַעֲנֵנִי	וַעֲנֵנִי (שפלי)	=
עא, 20	הִרְאִיתָנוּ (ע)	הִרְאִיתַנְיָ[411] (שתפלי)	=
שם	תְּחַיֵּנוּ	תְּחַיֵּנְיָ[412] (שפלי)	=
שם	תַּעֲלֵנוּ (י)	תַּעֲלֵנִי (שפל)	=

	כתיב	קרי	
קח, 7	וַעֲנֻנוּ	וַעֲנֵנִי[412] (שפלי)	=
אי' לג, 28	נַפְשִׁי (שחפ)	נַפְשׁוֹ[413] (לי)	=
שם	וְחַיָתִי (שפ)	וְחַיָתוֹ (י)	=

LIST 68

Biblical Aramaic—third Person feminine plural of Perfect Verbs.

In all these forms, the K uses the masculine form or termination. The Q seems to be more painfully exact in distinguishing the genders in the third person plural. Yet it is likely that this differentiation is not part of the living spoken language. Thus both Biblical and Mishnic Hebrew (the latter in increasing extent) rarely distinguish between masculine and feminine in the plural third person perfect of verbs. In the Mishnah, a common form is used for both genders in the imperfect as well as the perfect (יִקְטְלוּ, קָטְלוּ), a usage wherein one may discern the influence of the spoken Aramaic as well as the normal process of development, which tends to simplify grammatical structure.

	כתיב	קרי	
דנ' ב, 33	מְנָהוֹן	מְנָהֵין[414]	ק?
שם	וּמְנָהוֹן	וּמְנָהֵין	ק?
ב, 41	מְנָהוֹן	מְנָהֵין[415]	ק?
שם	וּמְנָהוֹן	וּמְנָהֵין	ק?
ב, 42	מְנָהוֹן	מְנָהֵין[415]	ק?
שם	וּמְנָהוֹן	וּמְנָהֵין	ק?
ד, 9	יְדָרוּן	יְדָרָן[416]	ק?
ה, 5	נְפַקוּ	נְפַקָה[417]	ק?
ז, 8	אָתְעֲקָרוּ	אָתְעֲקָרָה[418] (ת)	ק?
שם	בֵּינַיהוֹן	בֵּינַיהֵין[418]	ק?
ז, 19	כָּלְהוֹן	כָּלְהֵין[419]	ק?
ז, 20	וּנְפַלוּ	וּנְפַלָה[418]	ק?

LIST 69

SYNTAX OF NUMERALS.

The KQ fluctuate between the singular and plural, the construct and the absolute. The notes will make plain the grounds for the varying usages and will illustrate them by parallels.

	כתיב		קרי	
מלב'	ח, 17	שָׁנָה	שָׁנִים[420]	=
	יז, 16	שְׁנַיִם	שָׁנַי[421]	=
	כד, 14	עֲשָׂרָה	עֲשָׂרֹת[422]	=
	כה, 17	אַמָּה	אַמּוֹת[420]	=
יר'	כח, 1	בְּשְׁנַת	בַּשָּׁנָה[423]	=
	לב, 1	בְּשְׁנַת	בַּשָּׁנָה[423]	=

G. VARIATIONS IN THE USE OF PARTICLES.

LIST 70

USE OR OMISSION OF THE PARTICLES BETH, MEM, AND HE.

	כתיב		קרי	
שמא'	ט, 26	הַגָּג	הַגָּגָה[424]	=
שמב'	כא, 9	תְּחִלַּת	בִּתְחִלַּת (י?)	=
מלב'	יז, 24	וְסִפַּרְנִים (מד, ש)	וּמִסְפַּרְנִים[425] (פלי)	=
	כב, 5	בְּבֵית (ש?)	בַּיִת	=
יר'	נב, 11	בְּבֵית	בַּיִת	=
מש'	כח, 8	וּבְתַרְבִּית	וְתַרְבִּית[426] (ש?)	=

LIST 71

INTERCHANGES BETWEEN BETH, KAPH, AND MEM.

	כתיב		קרי	
יה'	ג, 16	בְּאָדָם	מֵאָדָם[427] (שספלי)	=
	ד, 18	בַּעֲלוֹת	כַּעֲלוֹת[428]	=
	ו, 5	בְּשָׁמְעָכֶם (שי)	כְּשָׁמְעָכֶם[428]	=
	כב, 7	מֵעֵבֶר	בְּעֵבֶר[429] ([ש]פ?)	=

	כתיב	קרי	
כד, 15	בְּעֵבָר	כְּעֵבֶר[429] (ש?)	=
שו' יט, 25	בַּעֲלוֹת	כַּעֲלוֹת[428]	=
שמא' יא, 6	בְּשָׁמְעוֹ	כְּשָׁמְעוֹ[428]	=
יא, 9	בְּחֹם (י)	כְּחֹם[428] (ל)	=
שמב' ה, 24	בְּשָׁמְעֲךָ (ש?)	כְּשָׁמְעֲךָ[428] (י)	=
מלב' יב, 10	בַּיָּמִין (ש?)	מִיָּמִין[430] (עפי)	=
כג, 33	בְּמִלְּךָ (פ)	מִמְּלֹךְ[431] (שלי)	ק
אס' ג, 4	בְּאָמְרָם (ו?])	כְּאָמְרָם[428]	=

LIST 72

ASYNDETON.

	כתיב	קרי	
יש' נה, 13	תַּחַת	וְתַחַת (לפי)	=
יר' ד, 5	וְתִקְעוּ (ל)	תִּקְעוּ (שי)	=
ה, 24	וְיוֹרֶה	יוֹרֶה (שפלי)	=
יג, 16	יָשִׁית	וְשִׁית[433] (ש)	כ?
מש' כז, 24	דוֹר	וָדוֹר[434] (שול?])	=
אי' ב, 7	עַד	וְעַד[435] (מד, פי)	=
איכה ב, 2	לֹא (ש)	וְלֹא[436] (פלי)	כ
ד, 12	וְכל (פול?])	כל[436] (שי)	ק
ד, 16	זְקֵנִים (ש)	וּזְקֵנִים[436] (פלי)	כ
ה, 3	אֵין (שוסף?])	וְאֵין[436]	כ
ה, 5	לֹא (של)	וְלֹא[436] (פי)	כ
ה, 7	אֵינָם (^{B}ש)	וְאֵינָם[436] (ש^{Q}פלי)	ק
שם	אָנָחְנוּ (ש)	וַאֲנַחְנוּ[436] (פלי)	ק
דנ' ב, 43	דִי (ת)	וְדִי (שפל)	=
ט, 5	וְהִרְשַׁעְנוּ (פ)	הִרְשַׁעְנוּ (ושת?]ל)	=

LIST 73

USE OR OMISSION OF VAV CONSECUTIVE.

In practically all cases, the variation is one between Yod (construed as the prefix of the third person in the imperfect)

and Vav (taken as the Vav consecutive). We endeavor in each instance to select the preferable form from which the variant was derived by a textual error.

	כתיב	קרי	
שו' ו, 5	יָבֹאוּ (שBתפ)	וּבָאוּ[437] (שAלי)	כ
שמב' יב, 22	יְחָנֵנִי	וְחַנֵּנִי	=
יט, 41	וַיַּעֲבִירוּ ([שפ?])	הָעֱבִירוּ[437a] (לי)	=
יש' ה, 29	וְשָׁאַג (שי)	יִשְׁאֲגוּ[437b] (שBפל)	=
מט, 13	יִפְצָחוּ ([שפ?]ס)	וּפִצְחוּ[438] (ע)	=
יר' ו, 21	יאבֵדוּ (שפלי)	וְאָבְדוּ[439]	כ
כא, 9	יִחְיֶה	וְחָיָה[440] (י)	=?
לח, 2	יִחְיֶה (ש?)	וְחָיָה (עי)	=?
יח' מב, 14	יִלְבְּשׁוּ	וְלָבְשׁוּ[441] (שפלי)	ק?
מה, 5	יִהְיֶה (שAל)	וְהָיָה (שBפי)	=
מו, 15	וָעָשׁוּ (שפ)	יַעֲשׂוּ[441] (לי)	כ?
מז, 10	יַעַמְדוּ	וְעָמְדוּ[442] (שפ)	=
נחום ג, 3	יִכָּשְׁלוּ (פי)	וְכָשְׁלוּ[443] (של)	=
תה' מא, 3	יְאֻשַּׁר	וְאֻשַּׁר[443] (ש[פלי?])	=
מש' ב, 7	וְצָפַן (שBפ)	יִצְפֹּן[443] (לי)	=
יא, 3	וְשַׁדָּם (י)	יְשָׁדֵּם[444] (תל)	ק
יח, 17	יָבֹא (ל?)	וּבָא[445] (פי)	=
כ, 4	יִשְׁאַל (ל?)	וְשָׁאַל[443] (שפיס)	=
דנ' יא, 12	יָרוּם	וְרָם[443] (שתפל)	=

LIST 74

INTERCHANGES BETWEEN VAV CONSEC. AND WEAK VAV.

	כתיב	קרי	
יה' יט, 29	וַיְהִיוּ	וְהָיוּ	=
יר' יח, 23	וְהָיוּ	וַיְהִיוּ[446]	=
מש' כב, 3	וַיִּסָּתֵר	וְנִסְתָּר[447]	ק

LIST 75

Syntax of Vav of Introduction.

On this Vav see BDB p. 254b. A clause of condition is often followed by a predicate, which is introduced by a Vav. Thus Hos 11:1 כִּי נַעַר יִשְׂרָאֵל וָאֹהֲבֵהוּ "when Israel was a boy, then I loved him." Or the Vav of introduction may come with no verb, as e. g. Gen 40:9 בַּחֲלֹמִי וְהִנֵּה or Pro 10:24 כַּעֲבֹר סוּפָה וְאֵין רָשָׁע. The more normal construction occurs in Gen 19:15 and Is 6:1.

	כתיב	קרי	
מלב' יא, 1	וְרָאָתָה	רָאָתָה	=
יר' ח, 1	וְיוֹצִיאוּ	יוֹצִיאוּ	=

LIST 76

The Use of כִּי אִם, K; כִּי in Q.

This group contains two uses of כי אם or כי. The first use is in the meaning "but rather"; see BDB p. 475, 2b. Here כִּי, with or without אִם, is permissible, cf. Gen 32:29 כִּי אִם יִשְׂרָאֵל by the side of Gen 17:15 כִּי שָׂרָה שְׁמָהּ. The second use is as an intensive in oaths in introducing the fact sworn to: "that." See BDB p. 475, 2c. Here, too, both the K and the Q are possible.

	כתיב	קרי	
שמב' יג, 13	כִּי אִם	כִּי	=
טו, 21	כִּי אִם	כִּי	=
יר' לט, 12	כִּי אִם	כִּי	=
רות ג, 12	כִּי אִם	כִּי	=

LIST 77

USE OR OMISSION OF THE DEFINITE ARTICLE.

	כתיב	קרי	
שמא' יד, 32	שָׁלָל	הַשָּׁלָל[449] (שי)	ק?
מלא' ד, 7	אָחַד	הָאֶחָד[450] (ש)	=
ז, 20	שְׁבָכָה	הַשְּׁבָכָה[451]	ק?
טו, 18	מָלָךְ	הַמֶּלֶךְ[451] (ש)	ק?
כא, 8	הַסְּפָרִים (ש)	סְפָרִים[452]	כ?
מלב' ז, 13	הָהָמוֹן (ש[B.A])	הֲמוֹן[453]	=
יא, 20	מָלָךְ	הַמֶּלֶךְ[451] (ש)	ק?
יד, 7	הַמָּלַח (ס)	מֶלַח[454] (שפי)	=
טו, 25	מָלָךְ	הַמֶּלֶךְ[451] (ש)	ק?
יש' כט, 11	הַסֵּפֶר	סֵפֶר[455] (ש)	=
לב, 15	וְכַרְמֶל	וְהַכַּרְמֶל[456] (ש)	=
יר' יז, 19	עָם	הָעָם[457]	ק?
לח, 11	הַסְּחָבוֹת	סְחָבוֹת (שי)	ק
מ, 3	דָּבָר	הַדָּבָר (ש?)	ק
נב, 32	מְלָכִים	הַמְּלָכִים[451] (ש?)	ק?
יח' יח, 20	רָשָׁע	הָרָשָׁע[452]	ק
איכה א, 18	עַמִּים (ש[A])	הָעַמִּים (ש[B])	=
קה' י, 3	כְּשֶׁהַסָּכָל (ס)	כְּשֶׁסָּכָל[458] (שפלי)	=
י, 20	הַכְּנָפַיִם (ש[B])	כְּנָפַיִם[459] (ת)	כ?

LIST 78

Qere vela Kethib.

Not all forms of Qere vela Kethib are here listed; merely those not susceptible of other classification.

	כתיב	קרי	
שו' כ, 13	——	בְּנֵי[460] (שי)	=
שמב' ח, 3	——	פְּרָת[461] (שפלי)	=
טז, 23	—— ([של?])	אִישׁ[462] (פי)	=

	כתיב		קרי	
יח, 20	——		כֵּן[463]	ק
מלב' יט, 31	——		צְבָאוֹת[464] (שפלי)	=
יט, 37	——		בָּנָיו[465] (שפלי)	=
יר' לא, 38	——		בָּאִים[466] (שפלי)	=
נ, 29	——		לָהּ[467] (שפי)	=
רות ג, 5	——	(של)	אֵלַי (פי)	=
ג, 17	——	(ל)	אֵלַי (שי)	=

LIST 79

Kethib, vela Qere, DUE TO DITTOGRAPHY.

See the preceding introduction. Only the examples of dittography are here included. That these too are not corrections will become evident from the notes to the passages.

	כתיב		קרי	
יר' נא, 3	יִדְרֹךְ	——	[468] (שפלי)	ק
יח' מח, 16	חֲמֵשׁ	——	[468] (שפלי)	ק

H. UNCLASSIFIED KQ.

In these examples the variations are not susceptible to classification. We have therefore catologued them according to their relative value.

LIST 80

K PREFERABLE TO Q.

	כתיב		קרי	
בר' ל, 11	בְּנָד (של)		בָּא גָד[469] (עסתפאיק)	כ
שמב' יא, 1	הַמַּלְאָכִים		הַמְלָכִים[470] (שפלי)	כ
טו, 28	בְּעַבְרוֹת		בְּעַרְבוֹת[471] (שליס)	כ
טז, 10	כִּי (ח)		כֹּה[472] (שי[ל?])	כ
שם	וְכִי		כִּי[472] (שפי[ל?])	כ
טז, 12	בַּעֲוֹנִי		בְּעֵינֵי[473] (י)	כ

	כתיב	קרי	
יח, 13	בְּנַפְשׁוֹ (ש)	בְּנַפְשִׁי[474] (פלי)	כ
יח, 17	לְאָהֳלוֹ (ש?פ)	לְאָהֳלָיו[475]	כ
כ, 23	כָּרִי	כְּרֵתִי[476] (שעסל)	כ
כא, 20	מִדִּין	מָדוֹן[477] (ש)	כ
כב, 15	וַיְהֻמֵּם (שפיול?)	וַיָּהֹם[478]	כ
כב, 51	מַגְדִּיל (שפולי?)	מִגְדּוֹל[478]	כ
כג, 18	הַשְׁלִשִׁי (פי?)	הַשָּׁלִשָׁה[479] (של)	כ
מלא' ה, 17	רַגְלוֹ (שפלי)	רַגְלָי[480]	כ
ז, 45	הָאהֶל	הָאֳהָלָה[481] (לי)	כ?
ט, 18	תָּמָר	תַּדְמֹר[482] (ש[A]?פלי)	כ
טו, 15	וְקִדָּשׁוֹ (שפלי)	וְקִדְּשִׁי[483]	כ
מלב' יד, 12	לְאָהֳלוֹ (ש?פ)	לְאָהֳלָיו[475] (לי)	כ
טז, 6	וַאֲרוֹמִים (פי)	וַאֲדוֹמִים[484] (של)	כ
יז, 13	נביאו (שפלי)	נְבִיאֵי[485]	כ
כה, 12	וּלְנָבִים (ש[B.A])	וּלְיוֹנִבִים[486]	כ?
יש' כה, 10	בְּמֵי	בְּמוֹ[487] (שפלים)	כ
מד, 24	מִי אִתִּי (של?)	מֵאִתִּי[488] (פי)	כ
יר' ב, 20	אָעֵבוֹד (שפל)	אָעֵבוֹר[489] (י)	כ
ד, 19	אָחוּלָה	אוֹחִילָה[490]	כ
ה, 8	מוּזָנִים (ש[B])	מְיֻזָּנִים[491] (מד, ש?)	כ
טו, 11	שָׂרוֹתִךְ	שֵׂרִיתֵךְ[492] (עפלי)	כ?
יז, 8	יִרָא (שפל)	יִרְאֶה[493] (י)	כ
כט, 23	הוּדַעַ	הַיּוֹדֵעַ[494] (שי)	כ
יח' ג, 15	וַאֲשֶׁר (ש)	וָאֵשֵׁב[495] (פלי)	כ?
כג, 42	סוֹבָאִים (ש[A.Q])	סְבָאִים[496] (פ)	כ?
הו' ח, 12	רִבּוֹ (ש)	רָבֵי[497] (לפיעס)	כ
זכ' יא, 5	וְאַעְשַׁר (של?)	וַעֲשָׁר[498] ([פי?])	כ
יד, 6	יִקְפָּאוֹן	וְקִפָּאוֹן[499] (שפלים)	כ
תה' י, 10	וְדָכָה (עס)	יְדַכֶּה[500] (שפלי)	כ
כד, 4	נַפְשׁוֹ (ש[B]פלי)	נַפְשִׁי[501] (ש[A]י)	כ
ל, 4	מִיּוֹרַדִי (שתפל)	מִיָּרְדִי[502] (עסי)	כ

	כתיב	קרי	
נט, 11	חַסְדּוֹ (שלפ)	חַסְדִּי[503] (י)	כ
קלט, 16	וְלֹא (מד, שפלי, עסת)	וְלוֹ[504]	כ
מש' יז, 27	וָקַר (שפ)	יָקַר[505] (לי)	כ
כ, 16	נְכָרִים (ל)	נָכְרִיָּה[506] (תפי)	כ
כב, 20	שְׁלִשׁוֹם	שָׁלְשִׁים[507] (שפלי)	כ?
כג, 5	וְעוֹף	יָעוּף[508] (שפליעסת)	כ
כו, 2	לֹא (שניפ?)	לוֹ[509] (ל)	כ
לא, 4	אַו	אֵי[510] (ל)	כ
אי' ט, 30	בְּמוֹ (ש)	בְּמַי[511] (פלי)	כ
י, 20	יָחְדָל (ל)	וַחֲדָל[512] ([שפ?]י)	כ
שם	יָשִׁית	וְשִׁית[512] ([שפ?]י)	כ
יט, 29	שַׁדִּין (שפלעסת[י?])	שַׁדּוּן[513]	כ
ל, 22	תְּשָׁוָה (פי)	תְּשִׁיָּה[514] (שת)	כ
לג, 19	וְרִיב	וְרוֹב[515] (מד, שפלית)	כ
לט, 12	יָשׁוּב	יָשִׁיב[516] (שלים)	כ
מא, 4	לֹא (מד, שפיתנל?)	לוֹ[517] (ל?)	כ
דנ' ב, 39	אַרְעָא	אֲרַעָא[518]	כ
ד, 5	אַחֲרִין	אָחֳרָן[519]	כ
ד, 19	רְבַיִת	רְבַת[520] ([ש?]פת)	כ
דבא' ו, 11	בְּנוֹ (י)	בְּנַי[521] (של)	כ
יב, 18	הַשְּׁלוּשִׁים (שלפ)	הַשָּׁלִישִׁים[521] (י?)	כ
דבב' ח, 10	הַנְּצִיבִים (שפי)	הַנְּצָבִים[522] (פ)	כ
כד, 27	וְרֹב (ל)	יְרָב[523] (י?)	כ
לד, 9	וְיִשְׁבֵי	וַיָּשָׁבוּ[524]	כ

LIST 81

Q EQUAL IN VALUE TO K.

	כתיב	קרי	
שמ' כא, 8	לֹא (עסתפ)	לוֹ[525] (שלאי)	=
יה' ח, 12	לָעִיר (שפל)	לָעָי[525a] (י)	=
ח, 16	בָּעִיר (י)	בָּעָי[526] (שפי)	=

	כתיב	קרי	
שו' טז, 25	כִּי טוֹב	כְּטוֹב[526a]	=
שמא' ב, 3	וְלֹא (ש?)פס	וְלוֹ[527] (לי)	=
יז, 23	מְמַעֲרוֹת	מִמַּעֲרְכוֹת[528] (פלית)	=
כ, 2	לוֹ	לֹא[529] (שפלי)	=
שם	עָשָׂה	יַעֲשֶׂה[529] (שפלי)	=
שמב' י, 9	בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל	יִשְׂרָאֵל[530] ([שלי?])	=
יב, 24	וַיִּקְרָא	וַתִּקְרָא[531] (פי)	=
יב, 31	במלכן	בַּמַּלְבֵּן[532] (שפי)	=
כג, 37	נִשְׂאֵי	נִשָּׂא[533] (שפלי)	=
מלא' א, 47	אֱלֹהֶיךָ (פ)	אֱלֹהִים (של)	=
מלב' ה, 18	נָא	——[534]	=
ח, 10	לֹא	לוֹ[535] (שAפלי)	=
יד, 13	וַיָּבֹאוּ (ל)	וַיָּבֹא[536] (שפי)	=
טז, 15	וַיְצַוֵּהוּ	וַיְצַוֶּה[537] ([שפלי?])	=
יז, 21	וַיַּדֵּא	וַיַּדַּח[538]	=
כ, 4	הָעִיר	חָצַר[539] (שפלי)	=
יש' י, 13	כְּאַבִּיר (ל)	כַּבִּיר[540] (י)	=
י, 32	בֵּית (י)	בַּת[541] (שפל)	=
סה, 4	וּפָרָק	וּמְרַק[542] (שלי)	=
יח' ט, 11	כַּאֲשֶׁר (שפלי)	כְּכָל אֲשֶׁר	=
צפ' ב, 7	בְּנֵי יְהוּדָה	בֵּית יְהוּדָה (פליש)	=
מש' יג, 20	הָלוֹךְ	הוֹלֵךְ (שפלי)	=
שם	וַחֲכָם	יָחְכָּם (שפלי)	=
כא, 29	יָכִין (שפליעס)	יָבִין	=
כג, 24	יוֹלֵד	וְיוֹלֵד[543] ([שפלי?])	=
שם	וְיִשְׁמַח	יִשְׂמַח[543] ([שפלי?])	=
אי' יג, 15	לֹא (ש?)	לוֹ[544] (עפלי)	=
איכה ה, 18	שהשמם	שָׁשֵׁם[545] (מד, ל)	=
קה' ו, 10	שהתקיף	שָׁתַקִּיף[546] (שפלי)	=
דנ' ד, 13	פִּשְׁרָא (לת)	פִּשְׁרֵהּ (פ)	=
ד, 16	וּפִשְׁרָא	וּפִשְׁרֵהּ (פת)	=

	כתיב	קרי	
יא, 18	וַיָּשֶׁב (וישפלת?ז)	וַיָּשֶׂם[547]	=
דבא' יא, 11	הַשָּׁלוּשִׁים (שפל)	הַשָּׁלִישִׁים	=
כב, 7	בְּנוֹ (ש)	בְּנֵי (לי)	=
דבב' לג, 16	וַיָּבֶן[548] (פי)	וַיִּבֶן	=

LIST 82

Q PREFERABLE TO K.

	כתיב	קרי	
וי' יא, 21	לֹא	לוֹ (שפלאי)	ק
כא, 5	יִקְרְחָה	יִקָּרְחוּ (שפלאי)	ק
דב' ה, 10	מְצֹוָתָו	מִצְוֹתָי (שפלאי)	ק
יה' ו, 7	וַיֹּאמְרוּ (ש)	וַיֹּאמֶר[549a] (פלי)	ק
טו, 47	הגבול	הַגָּדוֹל (שפלי)	ק
יח, 19	תּוֹצָאוֹתָיו	תּוֹצָאוֹת[550] (פלי)	ק
שו' טז, 18	לָהּ	לִי (שפלי)	ק
שמא' ד, 13	יַד	יַד[550a] (פ)	ק
יד, 27	וַתִּרְאֶנָּה (ש)	וַתָּאֹרֶנָה (פליע)	ק
יד, 32	וַיַּעַשׂ	וַיַּעַט[551] (ושסחי?ל)	ק
טו, 16	וַיֹּאמְרוּ	וַיֹּאמֶר (שפלי)	ק
יז, 7	וְחַץ	וְעֵץ (שפלי)	ק
כב, 17	אזנו	אָזְנִי (שפלי)	ק
כו, 22	הַחֲנִית	חָנִית	ק
ל, 24	הוּרַד	הֵירֵד[552] (שפלי)	ק
שמב' א, 8	וַיֶּאֱמֶר (?)	וָאֹמַר (שפלי)	ק
יד, 30	והוציתיה	וְהַצִּיתוּהָ (שופלי?ז)	ק
טז, 2	וּלְהַלָּחֶם	וְהַלָּחֶם (שופלי?ז)	ק
טז, 18	לֹא	לוֹ (שפלי)	ק
יט, 32	בַּיַּרְדֵּן	הַיַּרְדֵּן[550] (שפי)	ק
כא, 9	שִׁבְעָתַיִם	שִׁבְעָתָם (שפלי)	ק
כג, 13	שְׁלֹשִׁים	שָׁלְשָׁה (שפלי)	ק

	כתיב	קרי	
כג, 20	חַי	חַיִל	ק
מלא' ז, 36	וּמְסֻגְּרֹתֶיהָ	מִסְגְּרֹתֶיהָ (שפי)	ק
יב, 21	וַיָּבֹאוּ	וַיָּבֹא[553] (שפלי)	ק
יב, 33	מִלְבַד	מִלְּבוֹ (שפלי)	ק
מלב' ט, 33	שִׁמְטוּהוּ	שִׁמְטוֹהָ (שפליע)	ק
טז, 17	וְאֶת	אֶת (שפי)	ק
יט, 23	בְּרָכָב	בִּרְכָב (שפלי)	ק'
יש' מט, 5	לֹא (שB סתפל)	לוֹ[554] (עי)	ק?
נב, 2	הִתְפַּתְּחִוּ	הִתְפַּתְּחִי (שעסת[לי?])	ק
ס, 21	מַטָּעוֹ	מַטָּעַי (עסתפלי)	ק
סג, 9	לֹא (שפלי)	לוֹ[555]	ק?
יר' ב, 25	וְגוֹרְנֵךְ	וּגְרוֹנֵךְ	ק
כה, 7	הכעסוני	הַכְעִיסֵנִי	ק
לא, 40	הַשְּׁרֵמוֹת (ש)	הַשְּׁדֵמוֹת	ק
לח, 16	אֶת	——[556] ([של?])	ק?
מב, 20	התעתים	הִתְעִיתֶם	ק
מג, 11	וּבָאָה	וּבָא (פי)	ק
מט, 36	עוֹלָם	עֵילָם (שעספלי)	ק
נ, 6	שׁוֹבָבִים	שׁוֹבְבוּם (מד, שספלי)	ק
נב, 21	קוֹמָה	קוֹמַת	ק
יח' א, 8	וידו	וְיָדֵי (שפלי)	ק
ט, 5	עַל	אַל (שפלי)	ק
כה, 7	לְבַג	לְבַז[557] (שלית)	ק
כט, 7	בְּכַפְּךָ	בַּכַּף ([שפלי?])	ק
מד, 24	לִשְׁפֹּט ([של?])	לְמִשְׁפָּט[558] (פי)	ק
שם	וּשְׁפָטָהוּ (ל?)	יִשְׁפְּטָהוּ (שפי)	ק
מו, 9	יַצָּאוּ	יֹצְאֵי (מד, שפלי)	ק
הו' י, 10	עֵינָתָם (י)	עוֹנָתָם[559] (שלפ)	ק?
עמ' ח, 8	וְנִשְׁקָה	וְנִשְׁקְעָה[560] (שסתפ[לי?])	ק?
זכ' ד, 2	וַיֹּאמַר	וָאֹמַר (שפלי)	ק

	כתיב	קרי	
תה' נה, 16	יְשִׁימוֹת	יַשִּׁיא מָוֶת (שעספלי)	ק
ק, 3	וְלֹא (שסל)	וְלוֹ (עפי)	ק
קב, 24	כֹּחוֹ (של)	כֹּחֵי[561] (ספי)	ק
מש' ח, 17	אֹהֲבֶיהָ	אֹהֲבַי (שפלי)	ק
טו, 14	וּפְנֵי	וּפִי[562] (שפלי)	ק
יט, 19	גרל	גָּדָל[563] (שפליח)	ק
כג, 26	תִּרְצֶנָּה (ס)	תִּצֹּרְנָה (שפלי)	ק
אי' ו, 20	וְשָׁבִי	וְשָׁבוּ (שפי[ל?])	ק
כו, 12	ובחובנתו	וּבְתָבוּנָתוֹ (מד, [שפל?])	ק
ל, 11	יִתְרוֹ (ל)	יִתְרֵי[565] (שפי)	ק?
רות ד, 5	קָנִיתִי	קָנִיתָ (שלי)	ק
קה' ט, 4	יְבָחַר	יְחָבַּר[566] (שפלי)	ק
יב, 6	יְרַחַק	יָרָתַק[567] (ש?לפ)	ק
אס' א, 5	וּבִמְלוּאַת	וּבְמַלְאוֹת[568]	ק
דנ' ג, 29	שלה	שָׁלוּ	ק
ד, 21	מְטָיַת	מָטָת	ק
ה, 16	(פעמַים) תוּכַל	תְּכוּל	ק
ז, 10	אַלְפִים	אַלְפִין[569]	ק?
יא, 10	וְיִתְגָּרוּ (פ)	וְיִתְגָּרֶה (שלת)	ק
עז' ד, 2	וְלֹא	וְלוֹ (שפ)	ק
ד, 9	אַרְכְּוַי	אַרְכְּוָיֵא	ק
ח, 17	וְאוֹצְאָה (ש[ל?])	וָאֲצַוֶּה[570] (פ)	ק
י, 2	עוֹלָם	עֵילָם	ק
נח' ג, 15	וַיְעַמִּידוֹ (שפ)	וַיְעַמְּידוּ[571] (ל)	ק
ה, 9	וַיֹּאמֶר	וָאֹמַר (שפל)	ק
ז, 3	וַיֹּאמֶר	וָאֹמַר (שפל)	ק
ט, 17	וְחָסָד	חָסָד (של)	ק
דבב' יא, 18	בֵּן	בַּת (שלי)	ק
לב, 21	ומיציאו	וּמִיצִיאֵי	ק
לד, 5	מִזְבְּחוֹתַיִם	מִזְבְּחוֹתָם (י)	ק
לה. 3	הַמְבוֹנִים	הַמְבִינִים	ק

LIST 83

K AND Q BOTH UNSATISFACTORY.

	כתיב	קרי	
ויק' כה, 30	לֹא	לוֹ[572] (שפאי)	#
שמא' כה, 3	כְּלִבּוֹ	כָּלְבִּי[573] (שפלי)	#
כה, 34	וַתָּבֹאתִי	וַתָּבֹאת[574]	#
שמב' ה, 8	שָׂנְאוּ	שָׂנְאֵי[575] (י)	#
יד, 11	מַהַרְבִּית	מַהַרְבַּת[576]	#
טו, 8	יָשִׁיב	יָשׁוֹב[574]	#
כג, 21	אֲשֶׁר	אִישׁ[575] (שפלי)	#
מלב' ג, 24	וַיָּבוֹ (שפ)	וַיֵּיכוּ[575a] (י)	#
יש' ט, 2	לֹא (ל)	לוֹ[577] (פי)	#?
ט, 6	לָם רַבָּה	לְמַרְבֵּה[578] (שע)	#
יח' יד, 4	בָּה (פ)	בִּי[578a]	#
כג, 43	עַת ([וסת?])	עַתָּה[578a] (לי)	#
שם	יְזָנָה	יְזָנוּ	#
מ, 15	הַיְאָתוֹן	הָאִיתוֹן[579]	#
נח' יב, 38	לְמוֹאל	לְמוֹל[580] ([ש?]ל)	#
דבא' ט, 4	בְּנְיָמִין (פ)	בְּנֵי־מִן[581] (לי)	#

LIST 84

K PLUS Q EQUALS TEXT.

In these examples, which are unusually difficult, a solution is available if we combine the K and the Q to form the reading. It would seem that of two similar words, one set of manuscripts preserved one, from which our K is derived; while another group of codices is responsible for the preservation of the other, from which our Q is descended.

	כתיב	קרי		הטכסט המקורי
שמא' ב, 16	לוֹ (פי)	לֹא (פ)	#	לוֹ לֹא
מלא' כב, 49	עָשָׂר	עָשָׂה (שפלי)	#	עָשָׂה עָשָׂר[582]
יח' מב, 16	אַמוֹת	מַאוֹת (שפלי)	#	מַאוֹת אַמוֹת[583]
מש' יט, 7	לֹא (שסתפלי)	לוֹ	#	לֹא לוֹ[584]
דבא' יא, 20	וְלֹא	וְלוֹ (שפלי)	#	וְלֹא שָׁם לוֹ

LIST 85

Unclassified proper Names.

	כתיב	קרי	
ברא' ד, 18	וּמְחִיָאֵל	וּמְחִיָאֵל (פל)	=?
ל, 18 ועוד	יְשָׁשָׂכָר	יְשָׂכָר[585]	=?
יה' יח, 24	הָעַמוֹנִי (ש)	הָעַמוֹנָה[585a] (לי)	=?
יט, 22	וְשַׁחֲצוּמָה	וְשַׁחֲצִימָה[585b] (שפלי)	=?
כ, 8	נָלוֹן	גוֹלָן[585c] (שפלי)	=?
כא, 27	נָלוֹן	גוֹלָן[585c] (שפלי)	=?
שו' ד, 11	בְּצַעֲנִים (ש^{B}תפל)	בְּצַעֲנַנִּים[586] (ש^{A})	ק?
שמא' יט, 18	בִּנְוֹת (שפס)	בְּנָיוֹת[586a] (ל)	=?
יט, 19	בִּנְוֹת	בְּנָיוֹת	=?
יט, 22	בִּנְוֹת	בְּנָיוֹת	=?
יט, 23	בִּנְוֹת	בְּנָיוֹת	=?
שם	בִּנְוֹת	בְּנָיוֹת	=?
כ, 1	מִנְוֹת	מְנָיוֹת	=?
כז, 8	וְהַגִּרְזִי	וְהַגִּזְרִי[587] (שעלי)	כ?
שמב' יג, 37	עַמִּיחוּר	עַמִּיהוּד[588] (שפלי)	ק?
כ, 25	וּשְׁוָא	וּשְׁוָא[589] (לי)	# ?
כא, 16	וְיִשְׁבּוֹ	וְיִשְׁבִּי (שלי)	=?
כא, 21	שְׁמְעִי (ש)	שִׁמְעָא (פלי)	=
כג, 8	הָעָצְנוֹ	הָעָצְנִי (ש)	# ?
כג, 9	דֹדִי (ש^{B})	דֹדוֹ (ש^{B}לפ)	=?
כג. 35	חָצְרוֹ	חָצְרַי (שפלי)	=?

	כתיב	קרי	
כד, 16	הָאֲוַרְנָה	הָאֲרָוְנָה[590]	# ?
כד, 18	אֲרַנְיָה	אָרָוְנָה	# ?
מלא' יד, 25	שׁוּשַׁק (ש[B])	שִׁישַׁק (פלי)	ק
מלב' ה, 12	אֲבָנָה (של)	אֲמָנָה[591] (פי)	=
יז, 31	סְפָרַיִם (ש[B])	סְפַרְוָיִם[592] (שפלי)	=
יר' ב, 16	תַּחְפַּנְחֵס (שפל)	תַּחְפַּנְחֵס[593] (י)	=
כו, 18	מִיכָיָה (ש)	מִיכָהּ[594] (פי)	=
מ, 8	עוֹפַי (שעל)	עֵיפַי (פי)	=?
מא, 17	כִּמוֹהָם	כִּמְהָם (פיול?])	=?
מח, 5	הַלָּחוֹת (ש[B]ס)	הַלְּחִית[594a] (ש[A]עפלי)	=?
מט, 28	נְבוּכַדְרֶאצּוֹר (ל?)	נְבוּכַדְרֶצַּר[595] (פי)	=
תה' לט, 1	לִידִיתוּן (]שפל?[עסת)	לְיִדוּתוּן[596] (י)	=
עז, 1	יְדִיתוּן (]שעסל?[)	יְדוּתוּן (י)	=
אס' א, 16	מוּמְכָן	מְמוּכָן (יל)	=?
י, 1	אֲחַשְׁוֵרֹשׁ	אָחַשְׁוֵרֹשׁ (יל?)	ק?
עז' ב, 1	נְבוּכַדְנֶצּוֹר	נְבוּכַדְנֶצַּר[595]	=
ב, 46	שַׁמְלַי (ש[B]ל)	שַׁלְמַי[597] (ש[A]פ)	=?
ב, 50	נְפִיסִים (ש[B])	נְפוּסִים (ש[A]פל)	=?
ח, 14	וְזָבוּד (ש[A])	וְזַכּוּר[598] (לפ)	=
י, 29	יְרָמוֹת (פ)	וְרָמוֹת[599] (ש[A]ל)	=
י, 35	כְּלוּהִי	כְּלוּהוּ (]פל?[)	=?
י, 37	וַיַּעֲשׂוּ (ש[B])	וַיַּעֲשָׂי[599a] (פל)	=
י, 43	יַדּוֹ (ל)	יַדַּי[600] (ש[A])	=
נח' ג, 20	זַבַּי (ש[B])	זַכַּי[601] (פל)	=
ז, 43	לְהוֹדָוָה	לְהוֹדָיָה[602] (ש[A]ל)	=
ז, 52	נְפוּשְׂסִים (שלפ)	נְפִישְׂסִים[602a]	=?
נ, 54	בַּצְלוּת (שלפ)	בַּצְלִית[603] [602b]	כ?
י, 20	נוּבָי (ש[A]פ)	נֵיבָי (ל)	=?
יא, 17	יְדִיתוּן (]שפ?[)	יְדוּתוּן[603a]	=
יב, 9	וְעָנוֹ	וְעָנִי (פשול?])	=?
יב, 14	לִמְלוּכִי (ש)	לִמְלִיכוּ (ל)	=?

		כתיב	קרי	
	יב, 16	לַעֲדָיָא (ש?)	לְעִדּוֹא	=?
דבא'	א, 46	עֲיוּת	עַוִּית (פלי)	=?
	א, 51	עַלְיָה	עַלְוָה (לי)	=?
	ג, 24	הוֹדַוְיָהוּ	הוֹדַוְיָהוּ ([ש^{A}פ?]לי)	ק?
	ד, 7	יְצְחָר	וְצַחַר[604] (שי)	=
	ד, 20	וְתוּלוֹן	וְתִילוֹן (ש^{A}לי)	=
	ד, 41	הַמְעִינִים (פ)	הַמְעוּנִים[605] ([שלי?])	ק
	ו, 20	צִיף	צוּף (שפלי)	=
	ז, 1	יָשִׁיב	יָשׁוּב (ש$^{B.A}$ל)	=
	ז, 31	בִּרְזוֹת	בִּרְזָיִת (שפלי)	=?
	ז, 34	יַחְבָּה	וְחָבָה[606] (ש^{A}לי)	=?
	יב, 5	הַחֲרוּפִי (לי)	הַחֲרִיפִי (ש^{A})	=?
	יד, 1	חִירָם ([שפל?])	חוּרָם (י)	=
	כ, 5	יָעוּר	יָעִיר (שפלי)	=
	כג, 9	שְׁלֹמוּת	שְׁלֹמִית[607] (שלי)	=
	כו, 25	וּשְׁלֹמוּת (ש)	וּשְׁלֹמִית (לי)	=
	כז, 29	שִׁטְרַי (ש^{A}ל)	שִׁרְטַי (ש^{B}י)	=?
דבב'	ד, 11	חִירָם ([שפי?])	חוּרָם	=
	ט, 10	חִירָם ([שפלי?])	חוּרָם	=
	ט, 29	יָעְדִי	יָעְדוֹ (י)	=?
	יג, 19	עָפְרוֹן (שפלי)	עָפְרַיִן[608]	כ?
	יז, 18	וּשְׁמָרֵימוֹת	וּשְׁמִירָמוֹת (שלי)	=
	יח, 8	מִיכָהוּ	מִיכָיְהוּ (שי)	ק
	כו, 3	יְכִילְיָה (ש^{A}ל)	יְכָלְיָה (י)	=

APPENDIX C

The Classification of Madinchae KQ.

LIST 3A

	כתיב	קרי	מערבאי
איכה ג, 22	רחמו	רַחֲמָיו	רחמיו (שפלי)
איכה ג, 32	חסדו	חֲסָדָיו[760]	חסדיו

LIST 12

צפ' ג, 11	עלילותך	עֲלִילוֹתַיִךְ	עלילותיך

LIST 15

יש' נז, 10	אמרתי	אָמַרְתְּ (שפלי)	אמרת

LIST 16

תה' קלז, 5	אשכחך	אֶשְׁכָּחַכִי	אשכחך

LIST 17

יח' י, 11	אֹהַבְתִּי	אוֹהֶבֶת	אהבתי

LIST 18

שמא' ד, 15	קָמָה	קָמוּ	קמה
יר' מח, 31	נִתְפָּשָׂה	נִתְפָּשׂוּ	נתפשה
נ, 6	קָמָה	קָמוּ	קמה[761] (של)
נח' יג, 10	נְתָנָה	נְתָנוּ	נתנה

LIST 29

אי' ל, 13	להיתי[762]	לְהַוָּתִי	להותי

LIST 32

יואל א, 12	מִךְבְּנֵי	מִבְּנֵי	מךבני

LIST 33

	כתיב	קרי	מערבאי
יח' יז, 7	כָּפְנָה	כָּנְפָה	כפנה
כג, 46	לְזָוָעָה	לְזַעֲוָה	לזעוה

LIST 35

יר' כב, 14	וְסָפִין	וְסָפוּן[763] (שפלי)	וספון

LIST 41

שמב' ג, 35	לְהַכְרוֹת[764]	לְהַבְרוֹת	להברות
ו, 23	וָלָד (י)	יָלָד (פל)	ילד
מלב' כה, 12	ולגבים (ש[A.B])	וּלְיוּגְבִים	וליגבים
יר' ט, 21	הָאֲדָמָה	הַשָּׂדֶה(שפי)	השדה
לג, 3	וּנְצָרוֹת (י)	וּבְצָרוֹת (שפל)	ובצרות
יח' יג, 2	אָל	עַל ([שפי?])	אל (ל)
יג, 17	אָל	עַל ([שפי?])	אל (ל)
כב, 13	עַל ([שס?])	אָל	אל
מב, 8	אֶל	עַל	על (י)
מל' ג, 22	אל	על	על (פ"י)
אי' לד, 14	יָשִׁיב	יָשִׁים	ישים ([פלי?])
מ, 12	יְסָכְּהוּ	יְסָבְּהוּ[767]	יסבהו (פלי)

LIST 42

יר' לז, 19	ואי[768]	וְאַיֵּה (שפלי)	ואיו–ואיה
יח' לו, 5	כלא	כָּלָה	כלא
יואל ב, 22	שָׂדֶה	שָׂדַי	שדי
ד, 7	שָׁמָה	שָׁם	שמה
מי' ה, 1	וּמוֹצָאֹתָיו	וּמְצָאֹתָיו	ומוצאתיו
חב' ג, 18	בְּנִגְיוֹנוֹתָי	בִּנְגִינֹתָי (פלי)	בנגינתי
מש' יח, 20	תַּבִיאַת	תְּבוּאַת	תבואת
כא, 31	הַתְּשִׁיעָה	הַתְּשׁוּעָה	התשועה
לא, 7	מְאוּמָה	מְאוּם (שפלי)	מאום

	כתיב	קרי	מערבאי
קה' יב, 12	מַהֲמָה	מֵהֶם	מהמה
נח' ו, 2	בַּבְּפִירִים[769]	בַּכְּפָרִים	בכפירים
דבא' י, 14	הַמְלִיכָה	הַמְלוּכָה	המלוכה

LIST 48

יש' לח, 14	כְּסִיס[770] (ת)	כְּסוּס	כסוס

LIST 50

יה' ז, 21	וָאֵרָא	וָאָרְאֶה	וארא–וארא

LIST 51

יח' כג, 19	וַתַּרְבֶּה	וַתָּרֶב	ותרבה

LIST 53

יה' כד, 9	וָאָבִיא	וָאָבִיאָה	ואביאה–ואביא

LIST 54

רות א, 6	וַתָּקוּם	וַתָּקָם	ותקם

LIST 55

יר' לב, 34	ושימו	וַיָּשִׂימוּ (שפלי)	וישימו
מט, 12	ושתו	יִשְׁתּוּ (עספלי)	ישתו
תה' כב, 24	יגורו	וְגוּרוּ (פינול?)	וגורו
אי' יז, 10	יבאו	וּבֹאוּ	ובאו (שלי)
כב, 24	ישית (ל)	וְשִׁית	ושית (שפי)

LIST 56

יר' יז, 4	תִּיקַד[771]	תּוּקַד	תוקד
אי' מא, 2	יְעִירָנוּ	יְעוֹרְרֶנּוּ[772]	יעורנו

LIST 60

נחום ג, 8	הַתֵּיטִיבִי	הַתֵּיטְבִי	התיטבי

LIST 61

	כתיב	קרי	מערבאי
שו' א, 21	יֹשֵׁב	יֹשְׁבֵי[773] (י)	ישב (של)
יר' ח, 4	אם ישוב	אם ישובו	אם ישוב (שלופי?)
יח' מח, 28	מְרִיבוֹת (ש[A.B])	מְרִיבַת (ספלי)	מריבת
מש' ה, 19	ירויך	יְרַוְּךָ	ירוך (על)

LIST 63

שו' ח, 22	ויאמרו	ויאמר (ש[A])	ויאמרו (ש[B]לי)
יח, 9	קומה	קוּמוּ ([שלי?])	קומה
יח' מו, 6	תמימים[774]	תָּמִים ([שלי?])	תמימם

LIST 64

יח' יז, 14	לְעָמְדָה	לְעָמְדוֹ (י)	לעמדה (שסל)
מו, 21	אַרְבַּעַת	אַרְבַּע	ארבעת

LIST 65

יר' ו, 6	כְּלָה[775]	כְּלוֹ ([לי?])	כְּלָה (שעס)
קה' ט, 9	היא ([פלי?])	הוּא (ש)	הוא[776]

LIST 66

מלב' יח, 29	מִיָּדִי (ש[A]ל)	מִיָּדוֹ (ש[B])	מידו
יר' מח, 31	יָהֹגָה	אָהֹגָה	יהגה
הו' יד, 5	מִמֶּנִּי	מִמֶּנּוּ	ממנו (שפלי)
זכ' יג, 7	עֲמִיתוֹ[777] (י)	עֲמִיתִי	עמיתי(שעסתפל)
מש' ח, 19	פִּרְיוֹ	פְּרִיִי (עספלי)	פריי
אי' כג, 13	וְנַפְשִׁי	וְנַפְשׁוֹ	וְנַפְשׁוֹ (שפלי)
לז, 19	הודיעני	הודיענו (לי)	הודיענו
דבא' יז, 6	עמו	עמי	עמי (שפלי)

LIST 67

שמא' טו, 6	עמי	עמו (שלי)	עמו
יש' כג, 12	תוסיפו	תוסיפי (לפ)	תוסיפי

	כתיב	קרי	מערבאי
כג, 12	קומו	קומי (לפ)	קומי
יר' מט, 19	יעידנו	יעידני[779]	יעידני
צפ' ב, 7	תקחו	תקחי	תקחי

LIST 69

יר' מה, 1	בשנת	בשנה	בשנה
נא, 59	בשנת	בשנה	בשנת
יח' מו, 6	וששת	וששה	וששת

LIST 70

יח' מ, 25	באמה	אמה	אמה

LIST 71

יה' ו, 15	בעלות	כעלות	כעלות
שו' ח, 3	כדברו	בדברו	בדברו (שלי)
מלא' יד, 13	משער	בשער	בשער (שי)
יר' לו, 23	בקרוא	כקרוא	כקרוא
יח' יג, 9	כעזרך	בעזרך	בעזרך
עז' י, 3	בעצת	כעצת (שB)	בעצת (שA)

LIST 72

יואל א, 12	וכל	כל	כל (י)

LIST 73

יש' כז, 6	יפרח	ופרח	ופרח (שפ)
יר' לו, 23	וקרעה	יקרעה	יקרעה (שפלי)
יח' מג, 26	וכפרו (שפ)	יכפרו	יכפרו (לי)
אי' ה, 5	ישאף (שBעס)	ושאף (שAפלי)	ושאף
עז' י, 29	ישאל	ושאל (שפל)	ושאל

LIST 76

שמא' יח, 25	כי אם	כי	כי

LIST 77

	כתיב	קרי	מערבאי
יה' ג, 17	הארון	ארון[780] (י)	הארון
יר' לב, 12	הספר	ספר	הספר
יח' יח, 2	בנים	הבנים (ש)	הבנים
קה' ז, 2	המשתה	משתה	משתה
דבב' ד, 1	הנחשת	נחשת	נחשת

LIST 78

רות ב, 11	–כל	את כל[780a]	כל

LIST 79

יר' לב, 11	ואת המצוה	והמצוה[781]	והמצוה
רות ג, 5	את כל	כל[781]	כל

LIST 80

שמא' כה, 27	הביאה	הביא	הביא
יר' מה, 4	לי היא	היא	היא (שעספל)
יח' ה, 11	אגרע[782]	אגדע (לי[ס?])	אגרע
לב, 26	חתיתם[783]	חתית (פ)	חתיתם (ש)
מי' ו, 5	מה	מי	מה (שפלי)

LIST 81

יה' ח, 13	לעיר (ב' פעמים)	לעי	לעיר
יח' טז, 29	לכל	אל	אל (שפלי)
עמ' ט, 7	בני	בית (י)	בני (שפל)
צפ' ב, 7	בני	בית	בית (פלי)
אי' ו, 21	לא (פי)	לו	לו
דנ' ה, 8	ופשרא (ל?)	ופשרה (פ)	ופשרה

LIST 82

שו' ו, 25	השנים	השני	השני (שגל)
יא, 31	והעלותיהו	והעליתיהו	והעליתיהו

	כתיב	קרי	מערבאי
מלא' י, 22	ותכום	ותכיים	ותכיים
יר' כו, 24	בני	בן	בן (שפלי)
כט, 7	הגילתי	הגליתי	הגליתי
יח' ט, 8	ונאשר	ונשאר	ונאשאר
כב, 4	עד	עת (שלי)	עד (ת)
מ, 2	הבואני	הביאני	הביאני
מ, 3	ויבוא	ויביא	ויביא
מד, 3	יצאו	יצא	יצא
מו, 8	יצאו	יצא	יצא
הו' ד, 12	ומקולו	ומקלו	ומקלו (שעספלי)
נחום ג, 11	אתה	את	את (פי)
זכ' ד, 10	לפני	ביד	ביד (שפלי)
תה' מג, 3	יבואני	יביאני	יביאוני (שעסתפלי)
קט, 4	ישטוננני	ישטנוני	ישטנוני(שעסתפלי)
אי' י, 17	יצבא	וצבא	וצבא
יח, 13	בדו[784]	בדיו	בדיו (ש[A]לי)
דבב' כד, 24	במעצר	במצער	במצער (שפלי)
לג, 13	ויחתר[785] (י)	ויעתר (י)	ויעתר

LIST 85

יה' ח, 12	בית און[786]	בית אל	בית אל
טו, 53	וינים	וינום (שגפלי)	וינום
מלב' יז, 4	סיא[787]	סוא	סוא (ש[A]לי)
יר' כט, 22	וכאחב	וכאחאב (של)	וכאחב (פי)
נח' ז, 15	בנוי	בני (פ)	בנוי (של)
יב, 35	מיכיה	מיכה	מיכיה (של)
דבא' ה, 14	יחדי[789]	יחדו (לי)	יחדי (ש[A])
ו, 29	קושי (ל)	קישי	קישי (שי)
ז, 36	סיח	סוח	סוח (שלי)

LIST 86

כתיב הוא קרי הִיא

ירʼ כב, 16; כח, 17

יחʼ א, 13; יא, 7; יד, 17; טז, 46, 48; יח, 20; כא, 19; כו, 17; ל, 18; לב, 16

נחום ב, 12

רות א, 16

NOTES TO THE CLASSIFICATION

[1] In all these instances, the difference in meaning between K and Q is very slight, such as can exist only in a living tongue—evidence of the high antiquity of this group of KQ. Arabic '*afl* means tumor in the vulva or in the anus; *tahara* means to eject, טָחַר to strain at the stool, see Targum Ps 78:66. (See BDB s. v. טחר). It occurs twice in the Kethib, I Sa 6:11, 17. See Geiger: Urschrift p. 408 f.

[2] שגל has the meaning "to ravish". The word שֶׁגֶל as "queen" occurs in Ps 45:10 and Neh 2:6, and as a Palmyrene proper name, but it is a distinct, borrowed root, according to Lagarde: Bildung der Nomina p. 51, 153. See Feigin in AJSL, Oct. 1926, for a discussion of its etymology. Jakobs (die Qeri-Kethib in Buche Jeremia, 1922) points out that the verb may have an obscene meaning which the noun does not possess. He compares the German "Gatte" "consort" and the verb "begatten". Geiger (p. 407) maintains that the Q is an incorrect form based on a mistaken view of the את in Gen 19:34: שכבתי אמש את אבי, where the את was taken as a sign of the accusative instead of the preposition of accompaniment. The Q was invented merely to parallel the K. A renders the K, using the same root as he does for שֶׁגֶל (Ps 45:10) *synkoitos*.

[3] The K as two words can only be translated "dung of doves". Geiger's suggestion (p. 409) that we read the K as חִרְיוֹנִים "Menschenmist" has much to recommend it. The etymology of the Q as well as the grounds for its choice are obscure. Geiger finds a root in Arabic and Rabbinic Hebrew, meaning "to drip, overflow" (ibid.). Rashi connects the root with זוב "flow".

[4] The root חרי and חרא occurs in later Hebrew, Aramaic, Mandaic (see Noeldeke: Mandaic Grammar p. 56) and Arabic *hari* in the meaning "dung". צוֹאָה is a general word meaning "filth, uncleanness".

[5] The root שין or its cognates is found in all Semitic languages, so *thun* in Aramaic, *mathana* "bladder" in Arabic. The Q is an euphemism which is common in Rabbinic Hebrew as well.

[6] Though a singular is permissible (see Gen 41:42; Jer 27:8, 11), a plural finds ample warrant (Gen 27:16 et al). Yet the following notes will show that a singular is impossible in many instances of this group—thus creating a strong presumption that even the doubtful cases are in reality only plural.

[7] Only plural, cf. infra העמדים.

[8] Only plural, cf. v. 27, שחי טבעות.

[9] Cf. other plurals in verse. Probably defective because one Yod already occurs in the noun—and no desire to write two Yods in one word.

[10] Plural, both hands used in blessing, as in the Priestly Blessing today.

[11] Cf. שתי ידיו.

[12] Strong probability that only a plural is here intended.

[13] Cf. חקיו parallel to מצותו. It would therefore seem that in 7:9 and 8:2 only a plural is likewise meant.

[14] Cf. אָחָיו in same verse.

[15] Cf. והיו in verse. G uses the singular even when plene writing occurs, hence inconclusive.

[16] Cf. parallel רשעים.

[17] Cf. the plural verb.

[18] Cf. the plural verb.

[19] The idiom is הטוב בעיני י', only plural.

[20] V. note 1.

[21] V. note 12. G read למשפחות, substantiating the K?—Margolis.

[22] Cf. the parallel plural ברבבתיו.

[23] Probably a plural, especially after כל. See Deut 10:12; 11:22. Singular occurs once, Deut 5:30.

[24] Cf. דברו.

[25] Cf. 1 Sa 18:7.

[26] The K can be only plural because of its form.

[27] Cf. על בנותיו.

[28] Cf. ויקרעם.

[29] The plural is normal when referring to men's clothing, cf. Gen. 37:34.

[30] The idiom is נשא עיני פ', cf. 3:27; 4:19; Isa 51:6 etc., BDB p. 670b.

[31] No singular of this noun exists.

[32] Cf. חקותיו in the parallel stich.

[33] Cf. דבריו. Stier-Theile print *diataxin*.

[34] Cf. בין.

[35] Cf. the plural verb יהילילו. G reads *thaumazete* "wonder!", perhaps a free rendering of מְשָׁלוּ based on the frequent phrase משל ושנינה.

[36] Cf. כלם, עורים. G—imperative "behold"— צַפּוּ.

[37] Ginsburg: Masorah, letter Kaph, list #498, vocalized the K as וָמוּ!

[38] Cf. the verb עצמו.

[39] In his Masorah loc. cit., Ginsburg prints עיני as the K. In his Bible he prints עינו, as does Baer.

[39a] Cf. the plural verb.

[40] Cf. the plural verb.

[41] כל prefers a plural, cf. v. 24.

[42] See note 41.

[43] Cf. plural verb.

[44] The first two examples could be taken as singular, but the third is necessarily plural, ושבטי ישראל חבריו.

[45] All these architectural features of the proposed Temple are plural, and

cannot be construed otherwise. G transliterates *ailеu*, apparently rendering the consonantal Vav.

[45a] G—"to it"—עָלָיו P—"go up" עלות? V—"go up to it"—apparently a combination of both interpretations.

[45b] V "per eam" מַעֲלָיו?

[46] After כל a plural is preferred though not indispensable.

[47] Cf. חקות in parallel stich.

[48] Cf the parallel גבאיו. G reads בָּצַאתוֹ substantiating the K.

[49] Certainly plural, cf. the Vav after the Lamed.

[50] Certainty is impossible, but it is taken as a plural by LXX and Vulgate.

[51] It seems probable that יסערו is the subject of פרזיו (village chieftains LXX *dynaston*,) though the verse is very difficult.

[52] דרכיו is the subject of יחילו—"Prosperous are his ways."

[53] Cf. the parallel מבקשי.

[54] Cf. the parallel משפטיו, חקיו .

[55] Though the singular is permissible (as in צבא השמים), the plural occurs in Ps 103:21. The name ד' צבאות cannot be invoked here as it probably refers to the Lord of the Hosts of Israel, see I Sa 17:45, and Driver: art. Lord of Hosts, in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible.

[56] Cf. באצבעתיו. V uses the singular, which is, however, inconclusive as אצבעתיו is also translated by a sing.

[57] The singular would be אָרְחוֹ.

[58] Only the plural occurs, as in Isa 24:2, as a plural majestatis.

[59] Cf. the plural verb.

[60] Cf. the parallel שמים and especially 4:18.

[60a] No singular of this noun exists. S. r. "his sin", interpreting perhaps "youthful sins". Indeed, Hitzig renders the word in question, "Jugendsuende".

[61] Cf. the plural verb.

[62] Ginsburg's Masorah, letter Kaph, list #514, vocalizes the K as וְיָדְעוּ! Only the plural is possible, cf. the plural verb.

[63] Doubtful instances.

[64] Cf. the plural verb.

[65] Only the dual of this noun occurs. Cf. verb ברכוני.

[66] Cf. the plural verb.

[67] Cf. יִפְרֹשׂ.

[68] Cf. the plural verb.

[69] פחד is probably a loan word from the Arabic *faḫiḍ* "Sinews of the thigh (or thighs)". The singular seems to be preferred by BDB. Decision is difficult.

[70] The singular would be קִנְהוֹ. Cf. Isa 1:3 קִנְהוּ.

[71] An Aramaic plural. The singular would be קִנְתוֹ. Cf. from קְצָת the form קְצָתָם Dan 1:5.

[72] Cf. the plural verb יתנרו.

[73] The singular suffix form בֵּינוֹ is more common, and perhaps we are dealing with an error in the Q. Yet the plural suffixes are used in the plural persons, and perhaps יַחְדָיו offers an analogy.

[74] Prepositions take plural suffixes, either because of their ל"י source (אֲלַי, עֲלַי, עֲדַי, being the original forms of the prepositions אל, על, and עד respectively), or because they are essentially plural nouns, (מַרְגְּלוֹת, קִרְאָשׁוֹת, סְבִיבוֹת so Lagarde) or because of analogy based on the other prepositions (so Barth). See Gesenius-Kautzsch par. 103, 3 and note.

[75] That the Q עניו was intended to ensure the ו ending was already seen by Dillmann (on Nu 12:3) and Koenig: Lehrgebaude II, I, 76.

[76] The danger of error was greater inasmuch as the word is a hapax legomenon, as is ענו in the singular.

[77] In practically all these cases, the context makes anything but a masculine suffix an impossibility. For further details, see the discussion in chapter Three.

[78] The Q contains the same spelling as in Rabbinic literature. Cf. Aboth 1, 3. V—Socoth, P סוכא eq. שׂוֹכָה. The G as given is the restored reading of Prof. Margolis' edition of the Greek Joshua.

[79] See the preceding note. P and G (alpha) eq. K שׂוֹכָה. Origen, with Omega, eq. Q.

[79a] V r. "liba quoque vini" equals נָסֵךְ הַיַּיִן? This would prove the K.

[80] Place names, as is well known, are highly conservative. These instances ending in the o-sound go back to the time when the Holem He was the common spelling of the pronominal suffix. When the liability to error in this orthography was recognized, the Q noting Holem Vav was placed on the margin.

[81] The K may be not שׂוֹכה (his bough) but שׂוֹכָה (a bough). So Baer, Ehrlich. G leaves suffix unexpressed, eq. שׂוֹכָה K?

[81a] G. *Nechotha* eq. נְכֹחָה K.

[82] Cf. the masculine verb יילל.

[83] The suffix refers to ארני.

[84] In agreement with his predicate זרע.

[85] The Q is merely a direction as to the reading of the textual כלה. Yet, there is no doubt that the textual division is incorrect here. כלה מקללוני should be קִלְלָהֶם קִלְלוּנִי. (See commentaries, Delitzsch: Schreib- und Lesefehler, 3n). Here we have another indication that the correction of errors was not the aim of the Masoretes. P and perhaps V also r. כלהם קללוני. G—"My strength has left me in those cursing me", implying כָּלָה perhaps.

[85a] G—*diateleo* eq. כָּלָה?

[85b] A r. "O honorable one".

[86] Probably מואב is here construed as masculine, as in vv. 25, 26.

[87] Cf. the masculine suffix of ואנפיו.

[87a] G r. כָּלָה, cf. Wahl: Clavis Apocryphorum s. v. *synteleia*, which equals כָּלָה in Jer 4:27; 5:18, etc.

[87b] Reading Kames He.

[88] Ginsburg proposes בְּסָבְכוֹ, comparing Jer 4:7. Baer offers as an alternative reading for the K בְּסָכָה, which is adopted by Olshausen, Hupfeld and others. Yet the difficilior lectio בְּסָכֵּה is to be preferred. סֵךְ is a by-form to סָכָה, as חֵק is to חֻקָּה. See Jer 25:38.

[88a] See note 88. G (B), S vocalize בְּסָכָה, expressing no suffix.

[88b] S vocalizes שִׁירָה, hence no suffix.

[89] A expresses the feminine suffix ה..

[89a] The word לוֹ is spelled variously, לוֹ, לוּא (I Sa 14:30; Isa 48:18; 63:19) and לֻא. Besides the instances noted by the Q, see Job 9:33 לֻא יֵשׁ בינינו מוכיח and elsewhere. Thus D. Yellin in his Exegetical Notes on Job 3:10 (Jerusalem 1927) makes many changes of לֻא into לוֹ, at times, however, with insufficient warrant.

[90] The K, in ordinary texts and in Baer and Ginsburg, has one Yod, though several Firkowitsch mss. write the K with two Yods (See Kittel, Biblia Hebraica ad locum). The form with one Yod is even more liable to error in the reading, hence the Q.

[91] Cf. the parallel passage in Ps 137:7. ארץ cannot be construed without the definite article.

[92] Perhaps the K could be construed as a singular verb preceding its plural noun (See Ges-K 145, 72). Yet, in view of such passages as Gen 43:28, where no such explanation is available, it seems best to take the variation as orthographical.

[93] That only a plural is possible is proved by v. 19 ויאמרו. The LXX shows an inner Greek error, *eneteilato* for *eneteilanto*. (Margolis).

[94] The impersonal, idem per idem construction, יקח הלוקח, is possible here. The LXX likewise read a singular *lepsetai*, yet in the absence of any accentual system or even word separation, it is more likely that we are concerned with another case of unwillingness to write two Vavs in succession. GT יִקַּח; PV יִקָּחוּ.

[95] Another proof of the absence of sentence division. The second word belongs to the following verse.

[96] The hypothetical כִּי is uniformly construed with the imperfect.

[97] So in Ps 39:2.

[98] See the large number of omissions of Aleph in this root in list #7, due doubtless to the Vav in its root. G—"and they came", eq. וַיָּבוֹ=וַיָּבֹאוּ.

[99] Rabbinowitz and Obronin in their Hebrew Commentary on Job (Jaffa 1916) ad loc. remark upon the tendency to omit the Aleph in Job. אֲפוֹ occurs four times without Aleph (17:15; 19:6, 23; 24:25) and other defective spellings

are: מַלְפָּנוּ, מְשָׁחוֹ, נָוֹו, אָזְיִן, חַמָּה. In our passage the Q is essential to prevent an erroneous reading.

[100] That these contracted forms were favored by common speech is highly probable. Parallel to the K in Ez 8:6 we have the common Mishnic word מַהוּ. Yet each word might be wrongly read and therefore the Q.

[100a] GPV different—"will break down her gates" (פִּתְחֶיהָ) with ועת apparently unexpressed. I cannot determine the underlying reading.

[101] A Niphal reading of the K, נָטַע (cf. Isa 40:24), is possible though not probable.

[102] The K may be פְּדִים as in Num 3:49 or פָּדִים as a plural abstract noun, meaning "ransom", like פְּדוּיֵי in v. 48. We prefer the second view. O definitely=Q פריקיא. GJP "redemption" may be either הַפְּדִים or the abstract noun פָּדִים of the Q, more probably the former.

[103] Cf. especially Gen 22:13 and II K 3:27 for the pronominal suffix in this construction.

[104] Certainly plural; cf. in the same verse ויזעקו.

[105] Certainly plural; cf. in the same verse ויכינו.

[106] See other examples of this word in the same passage. B has the singular, A and its group, the plural (Margolis).

[107] In Ps 16:2 אָמַרְתְּ occurs without a KQ, as in II Ki 18:20 (Cf. the parallel passage Is 36:5 אָמַרְתִּי). It may be due either to a shortened form like Aramaic קְטָלַת or, more probably it belongs to older orthography. See Ges-K 44, 2, note 4.

[108] Note the large number of Yods: ידעתי כי יעשה, which may have brought about the loss of the first.

[109] The article with המביא makes an article with מוציא imperative.

[109a] G. difficult.

[110] So Ehrlich ad loc., who prefers the form without the article as being the form used exclusively in poetry.

[111] So vocalized by Baer. Ginsburg and others vocalize with a Kames: בְּחָרְבוֹתֵיהֶם. Both are unsatisfactory, see Delitzsch, op. cit. 4a, 95a. V reads: חָרֵב סָבִיב, P בְּרְחוֹבוֹתֵיהֶם, T בחרבותיהם, LXX (freely) "in their places."

[112] This nas always been a crux interpretum. The Q, as it stands, with דת a word of Persian origin, is impossible. Whether the K can be utilised either in the meaning of the Assyrian root "isdu" (foundation) or the Syriac root *eshad* (to pour) or the Hebrew noun אֶשְׁדָּת (Josh 10:40 and elsewhere) is highly doubtful. Emendations like אֵשׁ לַפִּידֹת or אֵשׁ יְקֵדֹת have been plentiful. See Dillmann ad loc. P יהב, G *aggeloi* eq. "strong ones" from אשדות? So Field.

[113] A highly instructive example: the two words that the K has joined belong to different stichs of the verse. This is already recognised by the accentuation, Rashi and Kimhi. P מן נורהו eq. מֵאֶשָׁהֶם.

[114] Though the word occurs in different forms: חַלְכָּה Ps 10:8, and חַלְבָּה 10:14, its existence is indisputable. The Arabic *halaka* "be black" is parallel to the Aramaic, חֶשׁוֹךְ "poor, unfortunate" (cf. Pro 22:29). Whether the Masorah meant the two forms quoted above as equivalent to חֵילֶךָ and חֵילֵךְ, as is asserted by Olshausen, Delitzsch, (par. 5a) and Cheyne, is uncertain. Yet Kimhi (עדת הנחלשים) and Ibn Ezra (כאים כמו נכאים) definitely interpret it as two words חֵיל כָּאִים "an army of dejected ones"—an explanation impossible linguistically. V—"pauperum", perhaps a a guess. T עניא; P בכורהנא וכאבא eq. the Q?

[115] The K is followed, and rightly, by LXX, Vul, Tar. Kimhi's attempt to interpret the Q as "proudest oppressors", though preferred by some (see BDB) is to our mind unavailing. Parallel to שאננים we expect one word—נַאֲוֹנִים. See Delitzsch ad loc.

[116] There is really no variation here. The K knows no final letters, and so the older, non-separated writing is preserved in the archetype, while the Q has already separated the words and employs the final letters. In Jb 40:6, the Q is incorrect.

[117] This name shows several fluctuations in orthography. In I Sa 25:32, אֲבִיגַל occurs, unchanged by the Q. See Noeldeke, ZDMG, 1883, p. 537 n. on this name.

[118] Its etymology has been variously given: 1) from יְרוּ and שָׁלֵם "a foundation of peace" (Gesenius). 2) from Uru (city) and Salim (nomen Dei), so Sayce, Jastrow. On the Tel-Amarna tablets it occurs already as Urusalim—(see Zimmern in ZA, 1891 p. 252–4 and Schrader: COT, Glossary for the Assyrian forms). Whatever its etymology, it undoubtedly falls into our group.

[119] The K is vocalized by Baer and Ginsburg as יְהוֹעַדִּין. We prefer to assume the same diphthongal absorption as in the other members of the group. דִּתַּן and דָּתָן are exactly parallel. Perhaps the LXX *Ioadeim* (Alexandrinus *Ioadein*) goes back to the diphthong "ai" contracted to "ei".

[120] Cf. the locative form found in the K: ירושלמה.

[121] This view is opposed by Ges-K 32, 2 note 4, who maintains that a late, contracted form אֵתְּ is implied by the K. This has however no warrant anywhere in Hebrew. The form אֵתְּ which occurs three times as a masculine is so vocalized because of an unwillingness to leave a vowel at the end of a word.

[122] Ges-K par. 32 note 4, insists that these forms were construed by the Masorah as first persons and hence left uncorrected. This is unlikely in the last instance, Mic 4:13, and is difficult in the others. It seems more in accordance with the spirit of the Masorah to maintain that, in these isolated cases, no variants presented themselves, as in the exception to list #13.

[122a] G: "you beswore me" eq. אָלִית אָתְּ, with the verb interpreted causatively.

[122b] G: "you have sinned to defile your ways", reading perhaps for the text

נַם אֶת הַרְעוֹת לְמַדְתְּ some such text as ... גַּם אַתְּ הַרַעְתְּ ל. I am unable to restore the missing verbal form that resembles למדתי graphically, and means "defile".

[122c] Vss. all read the Q שָׁמַעְתְּ, vocalizing as a third person feminine singular, thus שָׁמְעָה. This seems to be the interpretation of the accents, viz. שָׁמַעְתִּי נַפְשִׁי. Nevertheless the K is undoubtedly correct, and the verse is to be divided as follows: קול שופר שָׁמַעְתִּי // נפשי תרועת מלחמה.

[123] In the same verse the later form occurs in the text without any KQ.

[123a] G: לָכִי eq. K.

[123b] G(B) reads שִׁכְנֹת.

[124] Cf. Zech 11:17 ,עזבי הצאן ,רעי האליל.

[124a] P read the entire phrase as a singular: יְדַנוּ לָא שָׁפְכָה.

[124b] G read תוצאות as a singular, perhaps induced by the K.

[124c] G omits תוצאות and rend. וְהָיָה as a singular.

[125] G: שָׁפְכָה.

[125a] פנים is feminine in the Mishnic idiom בסבר פ' יפות; cf. BDB s. v. פנה.

[126] The older form of ל'ה occurs in Lev 25:21; 26:34; Jer 13:19 and Ez 24:12 uncorrected by the Q.

[127] The Q is an impossible form. Perhaps תְּהַלָּתִי is intended, parallel to קְרִית מְשׂוֹשִׂי. Cf. עָזִּי וְזִמְרָת יָהּ equivalent to עָזִּי וְזִמְרָתִי (?). As it stands, the K is preferable to the Q. G: *emen* meaningless; Complutensian read *ainen*.

[127a] G S P T r. the participle passive. V "circumspectans" eq. צָפָה or perhaps צָפוּי in a middle sense, cf. Can 3:8 אָחוּזֵי חָרֶב and the common Mishnic forms like סבור.

[128] Cf. Isa 27:4 אֶפְשָׁעָה.

[129] K is a plural "on its sides", cf. Bevan, Driver, et al. Cf. also the idiomatic Rabbinic phrase (Hullin 3a) וישראל עומד על גביו and the plural use of צואר before suffixes in Biblical Hebrew.

[130] The K is pronounced "meyoth", so Koenig op. cit. I, p. 287.

[131] So throughout the book of Daniel. It is possible that this pronunciation came about in order not to pronounce אֵל. More probably the variation is purely phonetic: "Da ni'el" became "Da ni'yel" in rapid pronunciation. See note 130.

[131a] Vss. r: "the prophet", which may be either K or Q.

[132] Po'el participle with Mem omitted. (So Driver). The root is used in the Pi'el in Rabbinic Hebrew in another connotation.

[133] K occurs in Ez 47:10, with no KQ.

[133a] G (B) r.: *hoi eisin* eq. דהוא. G (A) *Danaioi* eq. Q?

[134] Q is the form that appears everywhere else, and the K is probably a textual error. Yet it may be that היה and הוה offer an analogy to the הָיָה and הָוָה of our passage.

[135] The K is an erroneous form based on the analogy of "ō" imperfect.

Errors of this type are very frequent in Arabic and must have played an important part in the history of Hebrew. The reverse error occurs in the Ashkenazic ritual in the Amidah: מְחַל לָנוּ instead of מְחֹל לָנוּ.

[136] The K has Mishnic orthography.

[137] The Q occurs in MT in Isa 14:14; Am 4:13 and Jb 9:8. We have here an archaic feminine construct like חוֹמוֹתַי, מְרַאשׁוֹתַי with retracted accent before a monosyllable. See Ewald 211d, Ges-K 87, 5; "*bā mô the*" not "*bô mo the*". The Holem is reduced to Hateph Kames because it is now distant from the accented syllable, as e. g. "*bá mo the yaṁ*". Yet the K can be preserved with the receding accent thus: "*ba mó the yam*". Probably the Q is preferred on euphonic grounds.

[138] The word is a hapax legomenon, and either orthography is equally satisfactory.

[139] Here the explanation given in the prefatory remarks seems to apply with peculiar force. The Vav here is merely a guide to the Kames, namely, it stands for the vocalization רָדָפִי rather than רְדָפִי.

[140] The Poel form is correctly given in our K with Holem. A form similar to our Q occurs to my knowledge only in Is 44:13 (the second time) יְתָאֲרֵהוּ. There the Holem may change because of its distance from the accent, a reason which does not hold in our case.

[141] In all these examples the distance from the accent probably caused the reduction of the vowel. On the K cf. I Sa 5:3, 6.

[142] On K cf. II Ch 24:26, but see preceding note.

[142a] P r. כנעניא.

[143] The Q is the normal form. On the two forms of K and Q cf. אֱלָהִים and אֲלָהִים, similar pairs like אֱזוֹר and אֲזוֹר, and other examples in Biblical Aramaic.

[144] See Ges-K 102, 1, note. Normally, though not always, מן is preserved before the article. Yet Q is possible cf. Jud 20:15; Ez 43:6. See note 147 below.

[145] Exceptions to the syncope of the He occur quite frequently, I Sa 13:21 et al. See Ges-K 35, 2, 2 note.

[146] For the assimilation of this He cf. Isa 23:11; Jer 39:7; Pr 24:17.

[147] See note 144. Before softer consonants, מן is often unassimilated. Cf. מִן בְּנֵי Joel 1:12; I Ch 5:18 and מִן נַעֲרָתֵךְ, מִן קוֹל Ps 104:7.

[148] The explanation of our KQ will not differ from that of בוש and יבש, נוק (Ex 2:9) and ינק (ibid.) and perhaps ישם (Gen 50:26) and שים. We can assume either a metathesis of roots or that these are conjugated on ע"ו analogy and vice versa. See Ges-K 70, 2, note 2 end.

[149] The stem קהל has undergone quite extensive metathesis in Hebrew. Cf. לַהֲקַת קָהָל, and our verb root קלה. For a metathesis bringing about an

aspirate He at the end of a word cf. מְבַלְּהִים Esr 4:4 and note 151. P om. Vss. "gathered". The reading is indeterminate.

[150] The K occurs in the text in Isa 28:19 and the Q occurs elsewhere. Notwithstanding Ibn Ezra's objection (see his commentary on Isa 28:19) metathesis is probably the best explanation of the two forms. So also BDB.

[150a] A S read "tottering", from זוע, perhaps eq. K. G (Q mg): "dispersion" so also Th in 29:18.

[151] On the K cf. Isa 17:14 בַּלָּהוֹת.

[152] A hapax legomenon, and hence both forms are equally satisfactory.

[153] The K in the meaning of "bed, couch" is common in the text. Perhaps the varying form in the Q intends to differentiate between this meaning and that of "the lower projecting story of the Temple".

[154] The Q occurs normally; the K once again in 48:4.

[154a] G: "ropes". A: "paths" eq. Q.

[155] The noun occurs in varying forms. Besides the two forms of our KQ. we have שְׁרָקוֹת Jud 5:16 and שְׁרֵקָה several times more.

[155a] G: *eis Zogora* eq. צֲעָרָה.

[156] The word is an hapax legom.

[157] The Q occurs in Ez 42:5.

[158] There is doubt here as to the K. Cf. Baer and Ginsburg ad loc. If the form we have adopted for the K be correct, the Q is preferable, occurring in Hab 3:6, Jb 6:19, Ps 68:25. Yet the K is not impossible. Cf. Neh 12:31, תַּהֲלָכֹת. According to Ginsburg, the K is בהליכותם. Printed editions of Targum read במהכיהון, the rendering of this K. Lagarde's text reads במהכהון agreeing with Mad., as normally. G (A) PV—plural. G(B)—singular.

[159] BDB prefers the K in the meaning of "unattainable secrets". Cf. Jer 33:3 ובצרות לא ידעתם. G: "grown together". V "Fortified" eq. K? T renders "your strength" eq. Q?

[160] On the K cf. the Q on Isa 10:13; on the Q cf. Jb 3:8.

[161] The K as a pure participle is preferable: "those placed, i. e. dwelling in Casiphia". P: "placed" eq. K. V: "Nathinaeos" eq. Q. G. *Ton Athaneim* for which read *Ton Nathaneim*. Yet the underlying text is uncertain.

[162] See list 34.

[163] The K may be vocalised רַתִּיקוֹת like צַדִּיק, or רְתִיקוֹת as a parallel form to רְתָקוֹת (raphe) in Isa 40:19. The only warrant for the Q occurs in a dubious passage, Ez 7:23 עֲשֵׂה הָרְתוֹק.

[164] The Q form occurs in I Ch 2:21 and is given by LXX *Segoub*.

[165] Cf. the proper name זָבוּד.

[166] See list 34 and note 160. G: "strong ones" from עַתּוּדֵי אֶרֶץ (Isa 14:9), hence Q.

[167] The word is a hapax legom. P דלמחזא, G *Tou horan* eq. Q: רָאוֹת. S: "sight".

[168] The same KQ in Jer 52:31. The word is a hapax legom.

[169] The word proper is a hapax, though similar forms occur in Jer 5:20 18:13. On the form cf. Barth 82e.

[170] Perhaps in the meaning "your treasure", the substantive form of the K is to be preferred.

[171] Cf. זְעִיר in Aramaic and זעור in Syriac as parallel to our forms. However, the K is probably an error.

[171a] P ישוב goes back to Qere. GVT eq. Q.

[172] Cf. אביטל II Sa 3:4; I Ch 3:8.

[173] On the K cf. Gen 32:31; on the Q cf. Gen 32:34. G (B) r. *Pheliel* for which read *Pheniel* equalling K.

[174] The K occurs in the text unchanged in Jer 2:10; the Q in Isa 23:1 and elsewhere.

[175] On the Q cf. Ez 24:8; 26:4, 14, צְחִיחַ, and the noun צְחִיחָה of which this may be a plural. The K is almost certainly an error. We have included it here because of its superficial resemblance to the other members of this group.

[175a] P r מכיך עינא, proving a mis-reading into עינים, derived from K עניים rather than from ענוים Q.

[176] It would seem that the complete form preferred by the Q is אָשִׁיב שְׁבוּת. See conclusion 2 in the introduction and the examples in detail.

[177] The variation between these prepositions is not based on textual errors, but is inherent in the language itself. The same confusion is frequently met with in the Aramaic papyri of Elephantine and is often the basis of Madinchae-Ma'arbae variants. Other examples of this interchange of על for אל in the Bible are common. See BDB s. v. על, 7c.

[178] The meaning called for is "put to shame", see BDB. The Q is the Hiphil of בוש which always appears in this פ"י form, except in Ps 44:8 and 53:6. Yet the K from the root באש gives a similar and satisfactory meaning.

[179] The K from צור "to fashion"; the Q from יצר "to create, form".

[180] The K is to be preferred on the principle of the difficilior lectio. The root occurs in Arabic *baḥila* in the meaning "to be avaricious". Yet Rabbinic literature offers a far better parallel. בָּחַל means "to hasten". Thus in Mechilta, Bo, Pithcha 2 ביחל האביב ובא "when the ripening of grains came very early". Cf. Jastrow s. v. בחל for other references. נחלה מבחלת means therefore "a premature inheritance".

[181] For the K cf. Isa 65:22 and Canticles Rabbah at 5:15 ואחר מבלה אותו; for the Q, cf. Jb 36:11.

[182] Both the K and Q have no warrant in Hebrew. The few examples quoted by Jastrow sub verbum are plays on words and the Syriac parallel רהטא

(boards?) is very doubtful. See Budde ad loc. p. 6 bottom for further references.

[182a] G: "to make rare".

[183] For etymology see BDB s. v. The K occurs in the meaning "food supply" in I Sa 22:10 and "food" in Ps 78:25. The Q occurs in Gen 25:28 and Neh 13:15.

[184] The K is the plural of קְצָת on Aramaic lines (See Lagarde Bild. der Nomina p. 10). Other forms are found in Ex 30:5; Ps 65:9. The Q is plural of קָצָה, forms of which appear in I Ki 12:31; 27:4.

[185] On K cf. Ez 16:51; Hos 2:3; on the Q cf. Jb 1:4; 42:11; I Ch 2:16. The Palestinian and Constantinople recensions express our text; Egyptian and Syrian recensions omit. G r. ואת כל ביתי, thus showing יתי of our Q (Margolis: Joshua).

[186] This plene writing of ראשונה is by no means isolated. In Jb 8:8 and 15:7 רִישׁוֹן appears and in the Samaritan Pentateuch the Yod is always written in all forms of this word (see Koenig II, 1, 255 note).

[187] On the K, cf. Cant 1:9, 15; 2:10, etc: רַעְיָתִי; on the Q cf. Jud 11:38; Ps 45:15. The Q goes back to רַעָה a feminine form of רֵעָה which occurs in the K of Pr 3:28; 27:10. See below in this list.

[188] The K is preferred by BDB as exhibiting the root form.

[189] The K may be an example of the so-called apocopated plural, (see Cheyne on Isa 5:1), or we may be dealing with an abbreviation which was commonly practised in Biblical manuscripts. See Ginsburg's Introduction. The possibility of the K's being looked upon as an apocopated plural (or perhaps an abbreviation) of חצים must be taken into account in judging the rendering of the Vss.

[190] The correct form is in the K, see Driver. The Q form is influenced by מוֹצָאָךְ. It occurs in the text in Ez 44:5.

[191] The Q is impossible. The K is the softer form of יֵשׁ; cf. Aramaic איתי, Arabic *aisa*, Mich 6:10 הַאֵשׁ and Prov 18:24, אֵשׁ.

[192] The dual is usually found, Ex 26:27, Ez 46:19 etc. Yet the K is not impossible.

[193] This K, which meets us again in Jer 31:38 and Zech 1:16, is perfectly satisfactory. Thus נָאָה (Jer 48:29) by the side of נָא (Is 16:6). יָדָיו רָב לוֹ (Deut 33:7) has been plausibly explained as equal to יָדָיו רַבָּה לוֹ (as in Jud 9:29), based on Ben Sira 30:23 פֶּתַח (equals פְּתֻחָה) and 37:23 נָס (equivalent to נָסָה). See J. Klausner in שפתנו 1923, p. 49. Vss. are indeterminate, except G *synegmenoi* eq. "brought together" from קוה hence eq. K.

[194] The Q is a poetical form, see Ehrlich.

[195] The singular is נָוְיָא, the plural נְוְיאוֹת, like וֵתִ and וֵתִים. On K cf. Ez 35:8 יאוֹתַיִךְ-.

[196] On K cf. I Sa 10:14 אן; Jb 8:2 עַד אָן; Mishnic לְאָן. The Q is more common with Mem, see Gen 29:4, 42:7 et al.

[197] On K cf. Gen 3:22; Is 54:15.

[198] "Uth" and Ith" forms of noun are common. Cf. תרבות and תרבית, חרסות and חרסית, חפשות and חפשית. They are equally frequent in Aramaic.

[199] Barth, 124c, explains the K and forms like יְתוֹר, יְבוּל and יְקוּם, as transformations from תְּיוֹר, בְּיוּל, etc. The ending may be the same here as in אַשְׁרֵי, אַלְלַי etc. The meaning is connected with סור and סרר "sinners", see Targum, Rashi. The K and Q are therefore at least of equal value.

[200] The contracted forms הִנְּךָ, הִנְּךְ, הִנּוֹ (Nu 23:17; Jb 2:6; I Ch 11:25) הִנָּכֶם and הִנָּם are very common. The Q occurs in Gen 20:16 et al.

[201] The idiom עשה את הרעה occurs in Gen 39:9, Deut 31:18; עשה את הרע in II Ki 21:7 and elsewhere.

[202] The K is a collective noun "the gate of potsherds" i. e. where they were thrown, חַרְסוֹת being the plural of חֶרֶס, cf. חָרֵב, חָרְבוֹת Another view of K in note #198. G *charseith*, ASTh, *arseith* all eq. Q.

[203] The pronoun זאת is זוֹ plus the feminine ending ת. Here we have another feminine ending ה, superadded. Similarly in French "le demain" became "lendemain", which takes another article and becomes: "le lendemain".

[204] The K is construct, like קִנַּת from קִנָּה. See note 193.

[205] On the two forms of K and Q, cf. II Ki 19:13 אַיּוֹ and its parallel Is 37:13 אַיֵּה. The K may either contain an anticipatory suffix, like Ex 2:16 ותראהו את הילד, a common usage in Aramaic and Mishnic Hebrew, or it may be a petrified suffix like—יַחְדָּיו.

[206] The K is the plural of אני (Wright: Comp. Semitic Grammar p. 99). It is the regular form in Mishnic Hebrew.

[207] See end of note 205. The KQ are identical in meaning.

[208] See note 198. The Aramaic forms are both אוֹשְׁוִיתָא and אוֹשְׁוָתָא, so that Hebrew can have either the Yod or the Vav form. Thus Aramaic דמון yields Hebrew דְּמוּיוֹת similar to our K.

[209] The etymological form is best shown in the K. Yet the Q is the usual form of the adjective.

[210] The K may be an error due to מָשְׁי. Nevertheless Kimhi's interpretation (יו"ד נוספת) is borne out by such forms as חַצִי by the side of חֵץ I Sa 20:36. To the Madinchae, our K is Q.

[211] The K is vocalized by Ginsburg חַחָיִים. Unless we are dealing with a textual error, חָח Ex 35:22 may have as a by-form חַחִי, whose form exists in our K. The Q is normal, see Ez 19:4, et al.

[212] We prefer to vocalize the K with a Sere, cf. above הַהַרְאֵל and Mesha Inscription l. 12 אראל. Geiger (p. 292) maintains that in many instances אל was changed to איל "tendenzioes". That this has anything to do with our K spelling, is doubtful.

[213] On K cf. Is 14:6; 32:10, Hos 8:7; Jb 41:18. On the Q, Hos 7:2 et al.

[214] As we have vocalized the K, it is a variant noun form to the Q. It may perhaps be vocalized עֲלִילִים. מִדַּרְכֵיכֶם וּמַעֲלִילֵיכֶם הָרָעִים would be the plural of עֲלִילָה. Cf. חטים, פשתים, שטים, יונים, תהלים, etc. Cf. Ehrlich Randglossen vol. 1 p. 8 for a discussion of these plural endings. G—"from your deeds", as above!

[215] The Q is here definitely an older form than the K, evidence of mere manuscript variation. The K occurs unchanged in Jb 5:16.

[216] K meaning "God's knowledge" is preferred by BDB. On the form cf. שלהבתיה Cant 8:6.

[217] Perhaps the Q שׁוֹאָה goes back to · שַׁוְאָה, a metathesis from שַׁאֲוָה our K; cf. זְוָעָה and נַעֲוָה. More probably our K is merely an error.

[218] The K goes back to פָּנָה (as בְּכִי to בָּכָה); the Q to פנן, "apparently a parallel form", (BDB). So also זְנוּנִים from זָנַן and זָנָה. The difficult verse Ps 45:14 כל כבודה בת מלך פנימה has been emended by Krochmal and Graetz to פְּנִינִים. Perhaps the textual פְּנִימָה is to be vocalised פְּנִימָה, as in our K. On the final He as the ending of the oblique case, cf. Ehrlich 1, 6, Barth p. 352 and Ges-K 90, 2c.

[219] The K from רֵעָה; the Q from רֵעַ. See Ges-K 93, 3, 4; Koenig II, 1 p. 78 f., who point out that the original "ay" is contracted to "ē" before suffixes. Cf. מִשְׁתֵּיכֶם Is 5:12, Da 1:16; מִשְׁתֵּיכֶם Da 1:10; מַרְאֵיהֶן Gen 41:21 etc.

[220] The Q occurs in the text only twice, Pro 18:18; 19:13; and is an inexplicable plural from מָדוֹן. Either מְדוֹנִים (cf. מְקוֹמוֹת from מָקוֹם) or מְדָנִים (on Aramaic lines), which occurs in the text 6:19 and 10:12 deserves preference.

[221] See notes 187 and 219.

[222] On the K cf. Pro 7:9 as well as Deut 32:10; Ps 17:8, Pro 7:2. The KQ is a hapax legomenon. G—"eyeball" eq אישון K.

[223] We have vocalised the K with Kames, against Baer and Ginsburg, as a sign of an undetermined accusative, cf. Arabic *abadan*. D. Yellin in his paper in the Abrahams Memorial Volume discusses אֲבָדוֹן as an old accusative. The K would be an accusative on Hebrew ground, see Ehrlich I p. 6, Ges-K 90, 2c and Barth 216b.

[224] Cf. on K Isa 15:1; 16:3; 21:11.

[225] The K may differ from the Q only orthographically.

[226] Unless it be an error, the K bears the same relation to the Q as קְדוּמִים to קֶדֶם; or it may be vocalised בְּטֻרוֹם so Baer, Ginsburg and BDB, and we may compare תְּחוֹת and תַּחַת.

[227] The K is derived from מַחֲמוֹד; cf. Isa 4:6 מִסְתּוֹר, by the side of מִסְתָּר and Obad. 1:6 מַצְפּוּנָיו from מַצְפּוֹן. Or it may be vocalized מַחֲמוּדֵיהֶם. Cf. note 214.

[228] The יִן ending is no longer looked upon as an Aramaism. Besides such passages as I Ki 11:3; II Ki 11:13 and Prov. 31:3. it occurs also on MI, as

for example שְׁלִשִׁין. See Ges-K 87a. Vss follow Q. *Ho Hebraios* (eq. Aquila?, so Field, Reider) transliterates K. *thanin*, if the final letter may be trusted.

[229] פְּרָזִים cannot refer to the dwellers but to the dwelling places, cf. Deut 3:5; I Sa 6:18. We expect a word in apposition to היהודים. The K suits our text perfectly—it occurs in the meaning of "dweller in hamlet" in Meg. 19a פרוז בן יומו נקרא פרוז and is a participle passive used actively like אֲחוּזַי Cant 3:8 or סָבוּר in the Mishnah.

[230] The Q is the more usual form; yet the K shows the etymology more distinctly, see Koenig II p. 146.

[231] The Greek *Kitharis*, the Syriac "kitara" and the Latin "cithara", would seem to favor the K. Yet vocalic changes in borrowed words are common. The Targum in our current text reads קתרוס in Isa 5:12, but this is of slight value. See Krauss: Lehnwörter I, p. 193, II, p. 573.

[232] This noun occurs as סוּמְפַּנְיָה in Da 3:5, 15; in Syriac as צפוניא. See Krauss II p. 376, 390, on later forms, and Bevan, Book of Daniel, p. 41, as well as BDB for further references.

[233] Both etymology and meaning of the word are obscure, see Montgomery ad loc.

[234] The K is not regarded as necessarily a Hebraism. אנושא occurs in Nabatean inscriptions frequently, see Lidzbarski: Nord-Semit. Epigraph. p. 222; S. A. Cooke: Aramaic Glossary p. 219.

[235] The K is the original form: אָרָא with suffixes, which meets us in the Elephantine Papyri constantly.

[236] We follow Baer here against Ginsburg's contradictory text. Many etymologies have been proposed from Persian and Greek. See BDB for a full discussion. Our vocalization is based on the Persian "*ham ya nah*" as its derivation.

[237] The K is the plural of רַבּוֹ; the Q is the form more familiar in Hebrew. The assimilation of רבב is very frequent in Syriac.

[238] On Q cf. Isa 8:7. Cf. the KQ on Ex 37:8 in this list above and notes 184, and 185.

[239] K has the more original form.

[240] K is not a Hebraism. It occurs in the Aramaic of Jer 10:11 and in Nabatean. See Cooke p. 241, Lidzbarski p. 264.

[241] Cf. the Targumic forms גְּלִי and גְּלוּ in Jastrow. See also note 198.

[242] The K may be an absolute form like אֶשְׁרִי and אֶלְלִי (Cf., Ehrlich: Komm. zu Psalmen note 1). Perhaps it occurs in Pro 28:23 מוֹכִיחַ אָדָם אַחֲרֵי חֵן יִמְצָא (see Ehrlich ad loc.). It is perhaps used to vary the narrative in our passage.

[243] The Aramaic orthography of ירה meets us in II Ch 16:25 and elsewhere. See BDB p. 432a on this form.

[244] On the K's orthography cf. I Sa 22:2; Isa 24:2 et al where the vocaliza-

tion is however on ל"י analogy. On the Q cf. Deut 15:2; Neh 5:10, 11. P r. נשָׂאים "carrying".

[245] The K form occurs in I Ki 12:33; the Q meets us in the Talmud, Nedarım 10a לשון שבדו חכמים.

[246] The ל"א form of the Q is very poorly attested, Deut 28:66 and the difficult Hos 11:7. Normally the K form occurs.

[247] Besides the K in Pro 3:30, we have רוֹב in Jud 11:25, רב Jb 40:2, as examples of ע"ו forms.

[248] Though no other instances of ע"ו of this verb occur, the proposed emendation of Jb 33:27 יָשַׁר into יָשִׁיר (See BDB) is unnecessary, if it is recognised that שיר may occur in שור forms.

[249] See Nöldeke ZDMG 1883 p. 537. The possibility of ע"ו forms is not excluded. PVT r. "to rejoice". Gr. "rear well", perhaps due to a mis-reading of גול יגול K as נָדַל יִגְדַּל. The suggestion is however very dubious.

[250] The root is אול and occurs in Ps 73:4 as ובריא אולם.

[251] The verb is נוב; the Q occurs only in Malachi 1:12. G V—"fruit" eq K.

[252] Q a hapax legomenon.

[253] Q a hap. legom. On K cf. Isa 38:14.

[254] Q normal form. The K סוג occurs in different meanings in Rabbinic literature. See Jastrow s. v.

[255] Q, the normal form, yet the Arabic cognates are all ע"ו forms: "ring", *ḥauk*; "width", *ḥawak*.

[256] On K cf. Is 26:17; Ps 55:5; on Q, Jer 23:17; 30:23.

[257] The K occurs in another meaning in Is 33:21. The Q is undoubtedly right.

[258] On the K cf. Ps 57:7; 119:85; on the Q cf. Jer 2:6. 18:20 et al. Perhaps the difficult אשוח on Mesha Insc. line 9, 23 by the side of אשיח Ben Sira 50:3 may also be compared. G—"speech"=K שִׂיחָה!

[259] On the K cf. Isa 45:16 חָרְשֵׁי צִירִים "fashioners of idols"; on the Q cf. צוּר and especially the feminine צוּרָה. S "strong", a reference to God, cf. BDB s. v. צור p. 849b. A—"character" eq. Q from צוּרָה.

[260] The verb is usually ע"ו; Ps 22:20; 38:23 et al; yet the adverb is ע"י cf. Ps 90:10, and an ע"י form may well exist in our K.

[261] The word is a hap. legom.

[262] The eight פ"י verbs are יטב, ינק, יקץ, יצר, ילל, ישר, יבש, ימן. Forms on the analogy of the פ"ו occur as follows: מוּטָב, נוּצַר, שׁוּלָל, (Q in Mic 1:8, see note below), הוּשַׁר (Ps 5:9 K) and הוּבִישׁ (II Sa 19:6).

[263] Though the K is the normal form, the Q is a perfectly possible form. Another פ"י form of this verb occurs in the K of Jer 50:8 (See below). See also the Aramaic שֵׁיצָא.

[264] The normal Hiphil of יצק is on פ"נ analogy, cf. וַיַּצִּיקוּ II Sa 15:24. The imperative Kal preserves the Yod in Ez 24:3, like the genuine פ"י.

[265] The LXX read מוסד הַשָּׁבָת and Rashi interprets: "a roof beneath which one sat on the Sabbath." Kimhi assumes יסך as a root which occurs once more in Ex. 30:32. The form and meaning are obscure. G seems to be substantiating Q. P apparently secondary (from G)—בית שבתא.

[266] As we have vocalized the K, we have here merely a variation between Pu'al and Hiphil. For the K we have ample warrant in the Piel of Jb 38:12 and the Pual of II Ki 10:11; Ps 55:14 et al. Yet we prefer to assume a Hophal of a פ"י in the K which is to be vocalised מֻיְדַּעַת, as a passive to the Hiphil. Cf. הֻיְתַן in Bib. Aram., taken as a Hophal by Lambert, Barth and Strack: Gram. Bib. Aram. par. 17b. The view of Mühlau-Volck that ידע is a פ"ו because of the Arabic *wada'a* (ponere) was energetically and successfully contested by Delitzsch: Prolegomena p. 26 note, who compared Assyrian "idu" and Ethiopic *'ayda'a* "to announce"; "ידע von Haus aus . . . ein eigentlicher Stamm primae Yod ist. Woerter wie מוֹדָע sind Analogiebildungen." BDB recognises the primae Yod character of this root. Yet practically all forms commonly met with look like primae Vav!

[267] The K has the Hiphil on פ"ו analogy. Cf. Ps. 5:9 below. See BDB for cognates. The Sabean ותר is a פ"ו; the Arabic *yasara* is a פ"י—evidence of the danger of invoking cognates uncritically.

[268] The asyndeton of the K is preferable. Besides our passage, a פ"י form of ישב occurs in Ez 35:9 K תֵּישַׁבְנָה (See note 271). Arabic *wathaba* "to spring" and Ethiopic *'awsaba* "secum cohabitare facere" have nothing in common with the Hebrew root. For an altogether distinct etymology of ישב see Ehrlich, vol. II p. 323. T. r. וְתוּבִי eq. וְשָׁבִי. Perhaps T should be vocalized וּתְבִי eq. וּשְׁבִי.

[269] The known antiquity of place names makes the פ"י form in the Q preferable. Sabaean shows מיפע. See BDB s. v. Read for P מפיעת—מיפעת eq Q.

[270] The proposed vocalization of the K יָצָאוּ as an imperfect is impossible. We vocalize it as an imperative. See note 263. G read וְצָאוּ, derived from K.

[271] The Q is impossible, coming as it does from the root שוב. On this use of ישב of the K, meaning "to be inhabited" cf. Ez 29:11 לֹא תֵשֵׁב and often Ehrlich's assumption that the K is merely a plene writing for תֵּשָׁבְנָה is unnecessary, in view of our remarks in note 268.

[272] Though an error may be present, it is difficult to say whether the K or the Q is original. The form מוסר may be an "Analogiebildung" exactly like מודע, see note 266. G tr. "space". T משכללן מחיציא eq. מְיַסְּדוֹת הַצְּלָעוֹת eq. K.

[273] The Q שׁוֹלֵל is explained by BDB "apparently, barefoot, stripped". In Jb 12:17, 19, where this word occurs, an entirely different meaning is required. We prefer the K as a Shaphel formation of ילל (always פ"י) in the meaning "wailing". We shall then have perfect parallelism, for each stich will express the idea of mourning: a) אספדה b) שילל c) מספד d) אבל.

[274] On the K cf. Isa 45:2; on the Q cf. Pro 4:25.

[275] Unless the K is a textual error, we have here a פ"י noun from ילך. Cf. הֲיִלִיכִי Ex 2:9. The other Hiphil forms are on פ"ו analogy. Yet the possibility of the K being a plene writing of הֵילְכוֹת from הֲלָכָה must not be overlooked.

[276] K jussive (though not always so, cf. Ges-K 109, 2b); Q, simple futurity. In the Commination of Deut 28:15 ff., we have both jussive and simple imperfect forms mingled constantly.

[276a] GV from ירא. P omits. Targum eq. Q.

[277] The Madinchae reverse the KQ, proving the purely variational character of the divergents.

[278] The K can be construed as an adverb, so LXX, or as a verb like the Q.

[279] The Yod in the Hiphil imperative occurs in Isa 43:8; Jer 17:18; Ps 94:1 et al., while הַקְטֵיל forms occur in II Ki 8:6; Ps 142:5 (הַבֵּיט) and elsewhere. The K may therefore be vocalised הַבִּיט or הַבֵּיט. The הַקְטִיל form of the imperative occurs frequently in later Hebrew.

[280] Cf. the non-jussive וְנִירְאֶה, וְנָשׁוּב not וְנִרְאֶה.

[281] The K is certainly a scribal error. G omits. Palestinian recension seems to have read תָּקוּעַ equal to K? (Margolis)

[282] The usages of הלך are various. On the Q cf. Isa 3:16; Jer 50:4, BDB s. v. הלך 4c. Either one of the two infinitives of this construction may be changed into a finite verb: Jos 6:13 הָלוֹךְ וְתָקְעוּ; II Sa 13:9 הָלוֹךְ וְזָעָקָה. Or both may occur as finite verbs (Cf. BDB s. v. 4d) I Sa 2:26 הֹלֵךְ וְגָדֵל II Sa 3:1 הֹלֵךְ וְחָזֵק. The variety of construction renders our K a possible reading. G—unexpressed. Palestinian recension r. הָלוֹךְ, since תָּקוּעַ is likewise tr. by a participle.

[283] K, present time; Q past time. See Driver, Hebrew Tenses.

[284] The K, though called an error by Delitzsch Schreib etc. 58b, Olshausen 224d, Gesenius 67i, is defended by Ewald 238c and Koenig 1 p. 305 as a secondary form of the infinitive. Cf. I Ki 6:19 לְהַתֵּן.

[285] On the infinitive as an imperative see Ges-K 113, 4d and cf. especially II Ki 4:43.

[286] The infinitive absolute of ל"ה verbs in the form וֹת is doubtful. Hos 10:4 אָלוֹת may be a noun and Isa 22:13 שָׁחוֹת is the only remaining example. On the other hand, the K offers excellent sense; the parallel פָּקוֹחַ is an infinitive continuing a finite verb, cf. Ges-K 113, 4e. The K is preferred by Ehrlich and Bermann (in his Hebrew commentary on Isaiah or Bahir).

[287] Though BDB explains the K as lacking in a relative, it is manifestly a textual error.

[288] The K is translated by LXX, Vul. "vulnerans"; the Q means "hammered, beaten" (so most, cf. I Ki 10:16, 17 et al.) or bloody *shaḥata* (so Ehrlich).

[289] Finite verbs after לבלתי occur in Jud 27:18; Jer 23:14; Ez 13:3, as well

as after פן and למען. See Driver, Hebrew Tenses (par. 41 obs.) on these anomalous forms.

[290] The Q is a normal imperative, but the K is the precative perfect. Cf. Driver p. 19 ff. for an illuminating discussion of this use and compare Isa 21:14 קִדְמוּ, Ex 24:5 בָּשְׁלוּ and Ps 68:31 בְּזַר etc. For the Arabic cf. Caspari-Mueller par. 367, 6 and the common formula *salla 'allahu 'alayhi wasallama.*

[291] The K means: lit. "and I am almost moved-of-foot" (נְטוּי רַגְלַיִם).

[292] K has a paronomasia: כי מצאי מצאי חיים "he who finds me, finds life." For the paragogic Yod see list 17. GP vocalize מֹצְאַי מוֹצְאַי חַיִּים (from מוֹצָא).

[293] The verse is of difficult construction and the KQ variation is slight.

[294] K, Kal, cf. Deut 2:12, 21:22; Q—Hiphil cf. Deut 9:3 et al.

[295] K—Kal; Q, Hiphil. See Dillmann ad loc.

[296] On the K, Niphal cf. Gen 8:12; Q, Hiphil.

[297] The K may be either Poel form in the perfect or it may be vocalized in the meaning: "and Saul was told that David had fled to Gath and that he should not continue to seek him." The first explanation is preferable.

[298] On the Kal passive of ילד cf. Isa 9:5 and elsewhere; the Q is in the Niphal.

[299] The Q is construed as a Kal by Olshausen 241c, who compares וַתֹּחֶז from אחז (II Sa 20:9). Stade and Ges-K take it as a Hiphil: "exhibited delay". The K, as we have vocalized it, is a Piel (see Ges-K 68, 2 note). Other vocalizations have been suggested, as e. g. וַיֵּיחַר equivalent to וַיֵּאָחַר from נֵיאָחַר.

[300] On K cf. Lev 24:20; Est 9:13, where a jussive force can be sensed in the imperfect. G r. Q as יִתֵּן.

[301] The following וַתִּרְעַשׁ as well as the parallel in Ps 18:8 (וַתִּגְעַשׁ) makes the masculine form of the Q untenable. Vss. all seem to follow K. Q is impossible grammatically.

[302] On K cf. I Sa 23:26: II Sa 4:4 et al; on Q cf. Ps 31:23; 116:11.

[303] The K is Polal—passive to Polel, which meets us in II Sa 1:10 (וַאֲמוֹתְתֵהוּ) Ps 34:22 and elsewhere; the Q is the passive of the Hiphil.

[304] On K see the Kal in Jer 31:29; Ez 18:20, 27; on the Q cf. Deut 17:6.

[305] Parallel to the Hiphil of the K is the Piel, which likewise has the transitive meaning "to bring into bondage". See II Sa 8:11. For the Q cf. Jer 34:16; Neh 5:5.

[306] The Kal of the K meaning "to increase" is preferable to the Niphal of the Q "to be propagated" (cf. נון "fish" and דגה, שרץ, and their denominative verbs). So BDB.

[307] Koenig I, p. 511 assumes only one root מוש used both in the Hiphil and the Kal (against Boettcher). On the K cf. Isa 46:7; Ps 55:12; on the Q cf. Josh 1:8; Isa 59:21 et al.

[308] The root עור meets us in the Bible in the Polel יעוֹרֵד Ps 146:9 et al. In Ben Sira 4:11 we find, as in our Q, the Hiphil ותעיד לכל מבינים בה. In our passage then we have an excellent example of chiastic parallelism: a b b a,

אעידך parallel to אנחמך and אדמה parallel to אשוה. See the writer's paper in Journal of Theological Studies, Apr. 1933, p. 162 f.

309 On K cf. I Ki 11:8; on Q cf. Jer 44:23.

310 The K has its object, "the enemy", understood, so Jud 6:11 לְהָנִיס. Its advantage over the Q lies in the fact that וַיָּנִיסוּ and וַיָּרִיעוּ have a common subject "Gideon's men". Moreover, these two words may be joined to the following verse. That the word in question cannot very well refer to the camp מַחֲנֶה is evident from the fact that it is referred to throughout in the singular. See verse 22.

311 On the Hiphil of the K cf. II Ch 28:33 מַעְזְרִים. Probably a scribal error of Yod for Vav accounts for the anomalous form in the K.

312 See Kimhi. T: ובזמן דאיתינון עליה eq. (רַנַּע?) כִּי אַרְנִיעָה and so in Jer 49:19. G eq. MT.

313 On the K cf. v. 15.

314 The K is a masculine verb followed by its feminine subject רֹאשִׁית a perfectly regular phenomenon. It is preferred by Ehrlich. The Q implies a subject יעביר המעביר with ראשית as object.

315 The K makes הרע subject of יָשׁוּב; the Q makes ד' subject of יָשִׁיב with הרע as its object. The difficulty with the Q is that, throughout the Psalm, God is addressed in the second person, not the third. P=הָשֵׁיב and seems to go back to Q, or perhaps Q goes back to this reading.

316 The K is in the Hiphil; the Q is in the Kal. Both conjugations are usually transitive, cf. Ex 2:2, 3. Yet Ehrlich prefers the K on the ground that the Piel and Hiphil often have a reflexive or intransitive meaning, where subject and object are identical. Cf. Gen 41:14 וַיְנַלַּח, Deut 22:12 תְּכַסֶּה, and Ps 10:1 תַּעֲלִים. Our K therefore means: "hide themselves", which cannot be extracted from the Q.

317 We need here an intransitive meaning, which only the Kal of the K supplies. See BDB, Ehrlich and cf. II Sa 15:20 Q.

318 Ehrlich accepts the K in a very forced manner. The Q is probably correct.

319 The K makes "God" the subject; the Q makes עמו. The suffix on עמו makes it probable that the K is correct, so Ehrlich.

320 The K means; "to keep in remembrance", cf. II Sa 18:18, Ps 45:18; the Q means "to remember".

320a The verse is of difficult and uncertain construction. GPV r. הָרִים K. Th has Q.

321 The K has "God" as subject; the Q has קַרְנָנוּ which is feminine.

321a The Q demands an object; the K, being in the Niphal, is reflexive in meaning.

322 The Q makes נחלים subject of the verb and is to be preferred to the transitive Hiphil of the K. Ehrlich reads יִמְטִירוּ.

322a The K is a Po'el of שסה, the perfect of which meets us in Isa 16:13 שׁוֹשַׁתִּי. It is a perfect parallel to בּוֹזְזִים. So Duhm, Klostermann, Marti.

323 The Q is correct, cf. the parallel יָרֵעוּ.

323a The Q is preferred by Kraeling. Yet such constructions as וְאָנִי תְּפִלָּה, אֲרֻצְכֶם שְׁמָמָה render the K not unlikely.

324 The Q must make "God" subject to extract any sense whatsoever. The K is natural and unforced.

324a The K המבוא is the subject of the verse. Ehrlich cannot understand how the Masorah could err into correcting the K. But no real correction is here intended; the Q is a variation which in this instance is inferior to the K.

325 The slight nuance in meaning favors the Q here. See however list #56 and note 304.

325a The root מרק "to cleanse". The K חַבְּרוּת פֶּצַע תַּמְרִיק בָּרָע is: "blows that cleanse away evil". The Q is: "blows are a cleansing of evil". On K cf. Delitzsch, Nowack, Wildeboer, Ehrlich.

326 The K: "do thine eyes light upon it". No other example of the Hiphil, which the Q offers, is to be met with. See Toy, BDB.

326a The K: "bareness are his bones". The Q: "his bones are laid bare". The noun occurs elsewhere Nu 23:3 et al. The verb is unique in the Pual. P interprets the word in question as eq. to שָׁפַע, but in any event as a noun, and hence eq. to the K.

327 No other example of the Hiphil (but see Ehrlich ad loc.); the Q is normal.

327a The Q is a contraction always used in ע"ע verbs. See Strack 22a.

328 We have adopted Ginsburg's vocalization of the Q form שׂחח Kal. The Hiphil has a declarative force. Either reading is possible. See BDB s. v. GS "chatter" eq. וְחָשִׂיחַ. Another reading transmitted in the name of Symmachus is וְחָשׁוּחַ "is low".

328a The K occurs without change in Gen 50:26. It is merely a phonetic variant to וַיּוּשָׂם. (Cf. German "u" and "u" umlaut) Cf. Ex 30:22 יְיֻסָּךְ from יוּסַךְ and Strack p. 31 bottom. V passive. O—שויאו J—סדרו are impersonals equal to passives and therefore Q. G "he placed", as an active, is the K.

329 Though the Q as an impersonal plural is preferred by Kautzsch 47, g3, Bevan p. 105, and others, the view of Behrman and Prince seems to us more acceptable. The K שָׂוִי is a Pe'il thoroughly parallel to the Pe'il טָרִיד.

329a K is an Aramaic imperfect; the Q is the Hebrew form.

330 See Est 4:4 below. Both forms are possible.

331 The K has the less common suffix, cf. Hos 8:3 וְיִרְדְּפוֹ.

332 The K has a Yod in order to preserve the Sere reading in the suffix. The Q suffix נִי—ַ— is uncommon, see Isa 66:5 הִבְדִּילַנִי and Ges K 60, 2.

333 On K cf. v. 9; on the Q Gen 31:39. See Ges-K 72, 5 and note.

334 See note 330. On K cf. Ps 45:16; on Q cf. I Sa 17:10 et al.

335 The K has for its root חצצר, whence חֲצֻצְרָה. The Q has for its root חָצַר.

On the form see BDB s. v. and Ges-K 53, note 4 and 55, 3. Our vocalization of the K follows Baer, as a Hiphil; Ginsburg vocalizes it as a Piel: מְחַצְצְרִים.

[336] When the verb precedes a plural noun, the singular is perfectly permissible. See Ges-K 115, 7 and cf. Gen 1:14; Isa 13:22 among others. In referring to God's discourse, the singular is used 394 times (e. g. Ps 105:42 דבר קדשו), and the plural is used 60 times (e. g. Jer 23:9 דברי קדשו), so BDB s. v. דָּבָר III, 2.

[337] Perhaps the plural use of אויב is generic, like the Latin *hostes*, which is always used in the plural.

[338] Examples of both דם and דמים are plentiful. On K cf. I Ki 2:33; Ez 18:13; on the Q cf. II Sa 2:19; I Ki 2:32; Ez 33:5.

[339] Perhaps the K is an abstract noun like בְּחוּרוֹת, קְלוּלוֹת (see Ges-K p. 385) meaning: "open battle", as opposed to guerilla warfare. T *may* be expressing the plural form in the K by his rendering: עבדי קרבא מחבדרין.

[340] See Rashi for a Talmudic attempt to harmonize K and Q.

[341] On K cf. v. 26, 33, for the plural; Q refers only to Nathan.

[342] On plural of the K see v. 31. The singular in the Q is collective. See Burney: Kings p. X.

[343] Cf. on K, Gen 42:37; II Ki 22:5; I Ch 25:2a et al; on Q cf. Jer 5:31. 33:13 I Ch 25:2b.

[344] Ehrlich excludes the entire word on the score of dittography. Cf. 15:8 and 18:16 for the Q, which is correct.

[345] Not only the plural in the parallel בְּחֻרֶיךָ but also the abnormal vocalization of the Q instead of דַּלְתֵךְ , points to the superiority of the K, see Bermann ad loc.

[346] As the summation of many individual acts, the plural of an abstract noun may be used, see Ges-K p. 385. The K means: "course of their lives" BDB.

[347] On the plural of the K cf. Is 24:5; Ez 44:24, Neh 9:13 inter alia.

[348] The idiom is חוס עין פ', never the plural. Cf. Gen 45:20 et al.

[349] On the K cf. Ezek 16:26; 23:8, 17; on the Q cf. 16:15, 34, 36; 16:22 et al.

[350] The K refers to Samaria in the main, cf. v. 46 and also v. 52. The Q refers to all the "sisters", Sodom, Samaria, etc.

[351] The singular is translated by LXX and Vulgate and is somewhat to be preferred.

[352] On the K cf. the plural in Jer 18:15.

[353] The K is preferred by Ehrlich, who points to מַעֲנָה I Sam 14:14. The Q is unattested. Both the rendering of G "lawlessness" and of V "their sin" are derived from the K מענותם (rather than the Q) from עָוֹן.

[354] On the K cf. I Chr 17:19, 21; on the Q, Ps 71:21; 145:3; Est 1:4; 10:2.

[355] The idiom is always in the singular, cf. Gen 31:29; Deut 28:32 Mi 2:1; Pr 3:27.

[356] The plural is preferable in regard to the seven things hateful to God.

[357] Cf. v. 23 for the K; Ibn Ezra ad loc. experiences difficulty in making the Q intelligible, but see 17:4 שְׂפַת אָוֶן. Normally, though not universally, the plural is used.

[358] Either the singular or the plural is possible.

[359] The plural occurs; see Job 41:1; Dan 1:15 and Ges-K 93, 3.

[360] On K, cf. Ex 2:26; Deut 21:13; 22:3; Isa 3:6, 7; on Q, Gen 35:2; 37:3 44:13, et al.

[361] Though the idiom occurs in the singular in Ecc 1:8, the plural is possible, see Delitzsch ad loc. For the plural verb cf. Mi 4:11: וּתְחֶזְנָה בְצִיּוֹן עֵינֵינוּ.

[362] See Kautzsch: Gram. Bib. Aram. 54, 3,b. We should expect the plural, yet cf. רֵאשָׁהוֹן.

[363] The Q is slightly favored by the parallel עֹן, פֶּשַׁע.

[364] See Bertholet. Decision is difficult in this obscure verse.

[365] Chariots were driven with both hands, cf. II Ki 9:23.

[366] In the construct relation, the verb usually agrees in number with the genitive not the nomen regens, because of its proximity to the former. Cf. Gen 4:10; Ex 14:4; I Sa 2:4 etc. and Ges-K 146, 1 and note. The K therefore has יְכַסּוּמוֹ in the plural in agreement with שְׂפָתַיִם, and אֲשַׁתְּנוּ in agreement with אַנְפּוֹהִי. In both cases the K is to be preferred to the Q, so most authorities.

[367] אִישׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל is used collectively and may therefore take a plural verb, see Ges-K 145, 2 and cf. Jud 1:12; I Ki 20:20; Mi 4:3 etc. for other examples. De Rossi manuscript #20 reads בני, perhaps induced by the K. The G *hoi huioi* likewise points to the K. T: ואמרו אנש V: "responderunt viri", may be a rendering of the Hebrew collective.

[368] The K is more strictly grammatical, using a plural verb before a compound subject, cf. Gen 40:1 חטאו Job 3:5 יגאלהו and see Ges-K 146, 2 b. Yet the singular verb agreeing with the nearer noun, in this case יִרְבַּעַם, is well attested. Cf. Gen 7:7; 24:50.

[369] The singular verb before a plural subject occurs frequently as e. g. Jud 13:17 K; Isa 13:22; Jer 51:48; Ps 124:5, cf. Ges-K 145–7. The author or speaker starts with the simplest form of the verb, the uninflected third person masculine singular, and leaves it in suspense when a plural subject is then added, somewhat like an impersonal verb. G r. K, om. עבדי.

[370] The K agrees with the subject of the clause; the Q follows the rule of agreement with the predicate noun: לִשְׁנֵי גוֹיִם. This practice is met with in other languages, as in Vergil's famous line: "Hic, labor; hoc, opus est".

[371] Cf. note 368. The K is the plural subject of פרִיו and ועלהו, the Q is somewhat more normal in agreeing with the nearer noun פִּרְיוֹ.

[372] The Q is masculine, agreeing with the normal gender of מקומות. On the

other hand מקום is construed as a feminine in Jb 20:9 לא תשורנו עוד מקומו. See Albrecht, ZATW XVI, 1896, p. 52.

373 See Albrecht ibid p. 76. The noun פעם occurs as a masculine in Jb 16:28, I Ki 7:30; normally פעם is feminine as in the Q.

374 The form of the Q occurs in the following verse, yet the number of examples of the use of רֹתֶם are too few to establish its gender definitely.

375 In this verse, the K is masculine in agreement with the subject פָּרָה, which is masculine and is preferred by BDB. The Q is manifestly influenced by the following שְׁאָפָה. Kimhi ad loc. attempts to make of פָּרָה a common noun.

376 שָׁמֶשׁ is feminine in Ju 19:34; masculine in Gen 19:23.

377 שַׁבָּת, in itself feminine, has been influenced by its constant association with יוֹם to become common in gender. On the feminine of the K cf. Ex 31:12; on the Q, cf. Isa 66:2, 6.

378 The word in question refers to Moab, which may be feminine (when personified) or masculine. Cf. verse 20 הוֹבִישׁ מוֹאב כי חתה. Cf. also Nahum 31:15 for a similar change in gender.

379 כנף is normally feminine as in our Q; cf. however II Ch 3:11, 13, where it is apparently masculine.

380 It is possible, though hardly probable, that we have here merely an orthographic loss of He. The K is most likely an error.

381 Cf. preceding note. Yet in these abstract enumerations we find feminine as well as masculine numerals (contrast vv. 24, 29 with v. 21). The parallel however argues for the Q; yet here the He may be due to dittography, and the older orthography שלשהמה should perhaps be resolved into שָׁלֹשׁ הַמָּה instead of our text. The K would then be of equal value with the Q.

382 The Q is more normal; on the K cf. Zec 3:9, 4:10 where עַיִן is masculine.

383 Normally masculine as in our Q, המון nevertheless is used in the feminine in Jb 31:34 כי אערוץ המון רבה.

384 The Q has נערה as antecedent. The K, normally held inexplicable, is to be preferred on the ground of difficilior lectio. השיב נפש occurs in Ps 19:8, 35:17 and our idiom השיב לב appears in Mal 3:24 והשיב לב אבות על בנים. The antecedent of the K is therefore לִבָּה. The verse is therefore to be translated, lit: "To speak to her heart, to regain her estranged heart". See Ehrlich's entertaining remarks ad loc.

385 Decision is here difficult.

386 The Q has רעה as its antecedent, see Kimhi; the K has the abstract idea את אשר אני מביא as its antecedent, and hence the masculine is permissible. See the beg. of note 381 on the gender of abstractions.

387 Kimhi struggles with the Q (בם באנשי המחנה). From the connection the K seems far preferable (so Behrmann in Or Bahir ad loc.). P apparently read the K and vocalized בה.

388 The Q seems to refer to תּוֹרָה which is feminine. The K refers the pronoun to אֲשׁוּר and is preferred by Ehrlich and Behrmann ad loc.

389 This highly difficult verse has been variously interpreted and different nouns, masculine and feminine, have been suggested.

390 The K agrees with זאת the subject; the Q with עָמֵל, the predicate nominative. See note 370.

391 See preceding note.

392 The K agrees in number and gender with עינינו; the Q can only be interpreted as a casus pendens: "still are we—our eyes are longing".

393 In this crux interpretum it *seems* that the K agrees with ארץ; the Q with יתרון. G (B) construes הוא with מלך hence Q. G (C) supplies *Kai* before *Basileus*, and construes with יתרון, as do the Masoretic accents; but still masculine, i. e. Q.

394 The K agrees with its own clause, where the king is referred to in third person; the Q may be referring back to the preceding clause.

395 The Q goes back to verse 9: אנכי. The K is in the third person, because it seems to be third person in its own clause. Cf. the benediction of the Evening Service ברוך אתה ה' גאל יִשׂראל for a similar laxity in grammatical structure.

396 On the use of the first person cf. verse 6 לאבותם לתת לנו.

397 We follow the Q of Baer, cf. Norzi for the contradictory Masorahs. The K is more in line with the rest of the verse.

398 The parallel in Ps 18:33 is of no value for our text because of the change of verbs. See Vodel: Konsonantische Varianten etc. p. 25, who can make no sense of the Hebrew in Samuel because of the verb וַיְתַּר, whether from תור or נתר. So most commentators.

399 The K agrees apparently with תמים and the K in the preceding verse. The parallel in Psalms agrees with the Q as it does in the preceding verse. See note 398.

400 See Kimhi ad loc.

401 For the K cf. אָבִי in the parallel stich; for the Q cf. אמרים.

402 The entire discourse is in the feminine singular.

403 On the feminine cf. v. 19 הגלת and in the very verse לָךְ, תְּפָאַרְתֵּךְ. Yet the Q is preferable in the clause שְׂאוּ עֵינֵיכֶם.

404 On the K cf. עוֹשֵׁק as a collective plural as the antecedent; on the Q cf. דינו.

405 On the first person of the K cf. v. 16, כה אמר ה' v. 17 למנאצי; on the third person see v. 16 לא מפי ד', v. 18 דברו (primus). A striking instance where the prophet identifies himself with God is afforded by the Pesikta Rabbathi ed. Friedmann p. 131 b (reprinted in B. Halper Post-Biblical Hebrew Literature I p. 16 ff.) where we read אמר לה ירמיה מאיוב נטלו בניו ובנותיו וממך נטלו בניך ובנותיך מאיוב נטלתי כספו וזהבו וממך נטלתי כספך וזהבך וגו'.

406 For the third person cf. העמיקו.

407 On the K cf. v. 10 והיתה כשדים; on Q cf. שַׂמְתִּי נַחֲלָתִי.

407a *G Katelaben* eq. הֶשְׁיִנֵנִי. See on this Greek verb Margolis in AJSL, vol. 22, #2, p. 117.

408 K has an antecedent "Pharaoh"; Q, "God". See Kimhi ad loc.

409 This verse is usually emended to נוּדִי הָרָה כָּמוֹ צָפוֹר, with the verb referring to נָפָשׁ. Ehrlich prefers the K נודו on the ground that נפש would be addressed in the masculine, and he compares Ps 3:3 רבים אומרים לנפשי אין ישועתה לו.

410 On K cf. v. 9 thruout.

411 V. 18 uses the singular, v. 20 is doubtful, v. 21 again the singular, a common fluctuation in the Psalms.

412 No KQ according to Baer, see note. On the other hand see Ochla we-Ochla list 131 for Ps 108:7.

413 The KQ puts these words into Elihu's mouth; the K makes them the words of the penitent sinner. See Rabbinowitz and Obronin ad loc.

414 Antecedent רגלוהי.

415 Antecedent אצבעתא.

416 Antecedent צפרי.

417 Antecedent אצבען.

418 Antecedent קרניא.

419 Antecedent חינתא.

420 Usually in numerals below ten the plural of the noun is used, see Ges-K 134, 2. Yet examples of the singular like our K occur cf. II Ki 22:1; Ez 45:1 as well as II Ki 8:17; 25:17 K.

421 The use of the apposition in the case of the number "two" occurs twenty-six times, as e. g. Ju 11:3 שנים חדשים (BDB). The construct in the Q is more usual.

422 See Ges-K 134, a, b, for optional methods in the use of numerals.

423 On the use of the construct in dates cf. Ges-K 134, 4 note. It occurs without any KQ in Jer 46:2 and is common in Aramaic viz. בשנת חדה.

424 The K is locative; the Q is accusative. See Ges-K 118.2 and 90, 2 respectively.

425 The repetition of the Mem is optional. See II Ki 17:24 Q against Prov 28:8 Q and see note 426.

426 See note preceding. An instance where the preposition is repeated is furnished by Ex 3:22.

427 The K is to be translated: "the water stood, very far away, at Adam". On this use of Beth meaning near, at, by, cf. BDB s. v. II, I and cf. I Sam 29:1; Ez 10:15, 20. The fact that the Jordan was crossed on foot at Damieh in 1927 (S. L. Caiger: Bible and Spade, 1936) tends to confirm the K, rather

than the Q: "the water stood very far away from Adam". G r. for מְאֹד מַאְדָּם— מְאֹד מְאֹד hence Q. P eq. Q.

[428] On the temporal Beth see BDB s. v. V, I and Gen 2:4; 4:8; on the temporal Kaph see BDB s. v. 3b and cf. Gen 19:17; 24:30; 29:13 et al. G om. Palestinian recension, *en*, equals K.

[429] These two passages reverse each other. On בעבר cf. further Jos 24:2, 14 on מעבר, II Sa 10:16.

[430] Cf. Jos 12:7; 24:15 and note 429. G (B) *iameibein* is an error for *Baiemein* eq. K.

[431] Kimhi: K means to read במלכו בירושלים.

[432] Often the absence of the Vav heightens the poetic force of the verse.

[433] Though the Q as an infinitive in place of a finite verb, is possible, (cf. Ges-K 113, 4 and examples there), the K seems preferable as a parallel to וְשָׁמָה.

[434] On K cf. Ex 17:16.

[435] On K cf. Gen 10:19; on Q cf. Gen 19:4.

[436] In all these cases, except in La 5:7, the asyndeton is preferred on purely subjective esthetic grounds.

[437] The Q, and the accents, have an awkward division of words, viz.:

כִּי הֵם וּמִקְנֵיהֶם יַעֲלוּ וְאֶהֱלֵיהֶם, וּבָאוּ כְדֵי אַרְבֶּה לָרֹב.

The K (especially if אֹהֶל is taken in the sense of "family", cf. *'ahl* in Arabic) yields a far better structure:

כי הם ומקניהם יעלו, ואהליהם יבאו כדי ארבה לרב.

[437a] GP r. עברו from ויעברו? .וכל העם עברו את המלך

[437b] G r. *Kai parestekan*. It is hardly likely that it read וְשָׁאַר.

[438] K, a jussive; Q, an imperative.

[439] The K gives a far better rhythm (Kinah) thus:

וכשלו־בם אבות ובנים יחדיו // שכן ורעו יאבדו.

The Q is halting:

וכשלו בם אבות ובנים // יחדו שכן ורעו // ואבדו.

[440] The Vav of apodosis is in the Q, cf. Driver Hebrew Tenses 136–8, BDB s. v. Vav, 5a, and examples.

[441] The K is asyndetonic, but the Q seems smoother in the connection. For the same reason, the K of 46:15 is preferred. G r. וַעֲשׂוּ.

[442] After והיה the simple imperfect occurs circa 100 times, the perfect with Vav consecutive 85 times (See BDB p. 225a).

[443] In all these examples, the asyndeton and the imperfect is preferable, perhaps, to the perfect with Vav consecutive. We have indicated them as equal in value.

[444] The Q offers better parallelism, cf. תַּנְחֵם, though the Vav of result occurs, cf. Jb 4:6b תקותך ותם דרכיך; 36:12 מספר שניו ולא חקר; T: ונטלטלין בזוזי וסלף בנדים ושדם eq. K. ונדנכון eq.

[445] The sense of the passage according to the K is: "Justified is the first party, in his dispute; let his opponent come and cross-examine him" i. e. when one side of a case is heard it seems that that party is in the right, but let the other side come and expose the weakness of his position.

[446] On the K cf. Deut 28:29; on the Q cf. Gen 1:6 and Driver 135, 5. The progressive tense may come either in the perfect with Vav consecutive or in the imperfect with weak Vav.

[447] The parallel וְנֶעֱנָשׁוּ favors the Q with weak Vav. The K is erroneously vocalized by Ginsburg וְיִסָּתֵר which is meaningless.

[448] The form כי אם occurs in the text with no KQ in II Ki 5:20.

[449] The meaning of the verb, both K and Q, is in doubt, and the K without the article may perhaps be acceptable.

[450] Cf. Nu 7:3 ושור לְאֶחָד.

[451] Perhaps there existed in Hebrew an assimilation of the article in common phrases like a construct relation. Thus מַעֲבַר הַשְּׁבָכָה became מַעַבַרְשְׁבָכָה exactly as כְּהַיּוֹם became כַּיּוֹם etc. The Arabic article has a connective Aleph which in continuous discourse loses its vowel and this would perhaps offer an analogy: *'almalik* but *baitul malik*. This view would account for a large number of K in our group. Note also the frequency of בית המלך in this list. This hypothesis we advance tentatively, and have marked each Q as preferable.

[452] The ספרים have been described before (v. 9) and we should therefore expect the article, yet cf. Est. 4:12 where no article occurs in the text.

[453] In ככל ההמון ישראל, ישראל is in apposition with ההמון. Cf. Hebrew Tenses, par 190 (3rd ed.). On the other hand כל often has the article following. See Ges-K 127 note 4 and cf. Jos 8:11; I Ki 14:24 Jer 25:26; Ez 45:16. G (A) om ישראל. Reads K only.

[454] On K cf. I Ch 18:27; II Ch 25:11; on Q cf. II Sa 8:13; Ps 60:2. G (A) *Gaimele*; G (B) *Remele* for which read *Gemele* eq. Q without article.

[455] The K uses the article for the general statement.

[456] The K offers better parallelism (?) והיה מדבר לַכַּרְמֶל // וכרמל לַיַּעַר יחשב.

[457] Cf. note 451. Ehrlich holds both K and Q to be incorrect; he emends to שער בנימין; see 38:7.

[458] Cf. the parallel צדקת הצדיק.

[459] Cf. the parallel ועוף הַשָּׁמַיִם. A apparently בעל כנף or בעל כנפים.

[460] Probably בני fell out of the text before בנימין. Cf. however v. 25 ויצא בנימין. One Greek ms. om. בני.

[461] The K is perfectly satisfactory. The river *par excellence* is the Euphrates, cf. Gen 31:21; Ex 23:31; Nu 22:5; Isa 7:20 etc.

[462] The K has the impersonal idem per idem construction: ישאל השואל. Cf. Gen 48:1 and 48:2 ניגד לְיַעֲקֹב, ניאמר ליוסף.

[463] The Q is absolutely essential. כן fell out before בן.

[464] The parallel passage in Isa 37:32 reads ד' צבאות. Yet the K alone offers excellent sense.

[465] This Q is evidence that no corrections are here intended. The information offered by the Q could be gleaned only from manuscripts.

[466] The Q is regular: הנה ימים באים ונבנתה. On the form offered by the K הנה ימים ונבנתה cf. list 75.

[467] The K is superior rhythmically perhaps.

[467a] Origen adds אֵלַי.

[468] That we are not dealing with corrections is proved by the large number of examples of dittography uncorrected by the Q. Without subscribing to all his instances, we refer to Delitzsch Schreib- und Lesefehler par. 84–88. Cf. especially Ez 44:19 where three words are erroneously repeated. Or Ez 16:6, where four words are so repeated (doubtful).

[469] The LXX read the K which is preferred by most moderns. See Ehrlich and Spurrell ad loc.

[470] Though the Q occurs in I Ch 20:1 and is preferred by Driver, yet Graetz, (Geschichte I p. 254), Klostermann, and H. P. Smith prefer the K: "When the messengers of David went forth".

[471] Though the Q occurs in I Sa 17:16 (as a proper name) a long catena of scholars prefer the K (Thenius, Wellhausen, Driver, Buhl, Ehrlich etc.): "the fords of the desert".

[472] The usual explanation of the K, following the accents, is "What have you and I in common, sons of Zeruiah,—if he curses and if God told him to curse David, who shall, etc". The Q is thus interpreted: "Let him curse, because God has told him etc." Recently I. Eitan has published a new interpretation of the K which disregards the accents: "What concern of yours and mine, sons of Zeruiah, is it, if he curses? For if God has told him etc." See *Shvile Hachinuch* Tishri, 1929, p. 247 f.

[473] The Q is by common consent impossible. The K has been emended into בְּעָנְיִי; this is unnecessary. Our vocalisation בַּעֲוֹנִי with the suffix as an objective genitive "the sin committed against me" is perfectly satisfactory. Cf. Gen 9:2; 16:5 חֲמָסִי "The wrong done me". Driver in his Notes on Samuel claims that חמס would have been used in this sense in Hebrew, not עון. However this use of עון is to be found in Medieval Hebrew. Thus in the Rule of Asher ben Jechiel (I. Abrahams; Hebrew Ethical Wills, I p. 122) we read ותכנע לפניו לבקש ממנו מחילה אל יגבה לבך לאמר יש לי עון ממנו which Abrahams well translates: "I am the injured party etc." GV "My affliction" eq. בעניי.

[474] K meaning "against his life" (sc. Absalom) is preferred by Driver and H. P. Smith. On this meaning of נפש cf. I Ki 2:23; Pro 7:23; La 5:9.

[475] The idiom with אִישׁ is singular, cf. Gen 10:5 אִישׁ לִלְשׁוֹנוֹ. The Q may be no manuscript variant, merely an erroneous mater lectionis.

[476] The K is preferred by Driver, Wellhausen et al. in the meaning "Carians". It occurs in the text unchanged in II Ki 11:19. For another view of כרתי ופלתי see B. Levin: זוגי מלים בתנ"ך.

[477] The Q is universally recognized as impossible. H. P. Smith reads מְדָה. Yet our K requires no change. In Nu 13:22 אִישׁ מִדּוֹת appears; here מִדִּין, is the corresponding form, like לְבַנִּים, לְבֵנוֹת; חַיִּים, חַיּוֹת; חֻטִּים, חִטּוֹת. (See Ehrlich vol. 1 p. 6). The ין ending to which Driver objects as being chiefly late is well attested; not merely does it appear in I K 11:33 צדנין but also on the Mesha Inscription מלכין, proving the antiquity of the form. G *Madon* eq. Q. A "Adversary"; P "measured"; T "hero"; all indeterminate.

[478] See parallel in Psalms.

[479] In this difficult passage, the K may be taken as an apocopated plural from הַשָּׁלְשִׁים (so Ehrlich) or as הַשִּׁלְשִׁים (so Wellhausen, Graetz). T נבריא may be the K vocalized as שָׁלְשִׁים. Cf. 23:13 where מהשלשים is rendered נברי without "thirty" being expressed, though previously שְׁלֹשָׁה Q is tr. תלתא נבריא. P r. K as שָׁלְשִׁים.

[480] K refers to David; Q to Solomon.

[481] The Q offers manifest difficulties. Stade pointed out that the Vav before ואת כל הכלים האלה is unnecessary, which he accordingly deleted. If we keep the K, however, translating: "And all the vessels of the Tent" (cf. I K. 8:4=II Ch 5:5) the Vav is in place. The difficulty of כָּל הַכֵּלִים הָאֹהֶל can be partially overcome by assuming this as an example of apposition. Cf. Ex 39:17; II Ki 16:12; Ez 8:29 הַלְּשָׁכוֹת בֵּית ה' (Driver, *Hebrew Tenses*, on Apposition and Ges-K 127, note 4). It is possible that our K was changed because of the distasteful idea that Hiram built the vessels of the Tent. Yet the preceding verses *do* attribute to him all the Temple utensils.

[482] The K occurs in the text of Ez 47:19, 48:28 and is preferred by a long catena of scholars. See Burney ad loc. and BDB s. v. Palmyra (Tadmor) is too remote a locality for our context. See Buhl Geographie, G. A. Smith, Historical Geography p. 270 note 2, p. 580, note 2. G (A) *Thermath* eq. תרמת, error for תדמר=Q? Stier and Theile r. *Thamor*.

[483] The Q is unintelligible (Ehrlich). The LXX cf. II Ch 15:18 translates the K. V "et voverat"=וַיִּקְדְּשׁוּ? GPT: וְקִדְּשָׁיו.

[484] The capture of Elath by Rezin of Aram would presuppose Aramean settlers. To maintain the Q, Burney deletes רְצִין and changes מלך אֲרָם into מלך אֱדֹם, basing himself on such passages as I Ki 9:26, II Ki 14:7, 22 where Edom is spoken of as the original owner. Yet השיב may not mean "restore to its previous owner", (cf. II Ki 14:22) but rather "annexed". Moreover, there is no reason why the Edomites should only now be described as settling in a city admittedly theirs. S. Raphaeli in *Sepher Hashanah*, vol. 1, p. 78

maintains that Edom and Aram had so well intermingled by this time that both K and Q are correct.

[485] Rashi's ingenious attempt notwithstanding, the Q is impossible. The K was vocalized by Burney on the basis of the Targum as כָּל נָבִיא וְכָל חָזֶה (כל ספר כל מליץ). G נְבִיאָו. PV like T.

[486] The Q occurs in Jer 52:16. On the other hand, Jer 39:10 reads כְּרָמִים וְיוגְבִים "vineyards and fields(?)", from *jāba* "press". Koenig, 1, 2, p. 105 derives the Hebrew of our K meaning "plowman" from *jawba* "pit". See Burney ad loc. G (B) TABEIN error in uncials for GABEIN eq. K.

[487] See Jb 9:3 for the reverse KQ. Ehrlich, Behrmann, BDB et al, prefer the K, comparing the following simile of the swimmer to substantiate it. Parallels to the Q בְּמוֹ occur in Jb 27:14 לְמוֹ, in the ordinary כָּמוֹ, and in the K of Jb 9:3. S *hos* eq כְּמוֹ?

[488] For the K cf. the parallel לְבַדִּי.

[489] The verse can be translated according to the Q only as follows:—"Because of yore did I break thy yoke, and I burst asunder thy bonds, and thou didst say, I will not transgress." Yet the context is against this interpretation and practically all the moderns vocalize and understand שברתי and נתקתי as second person feminine forms: שָׁבַרְתְּי and נָתַקְתְּי (see list 15). In accordance with the K, the following interpretation emerges: "For of yore didst thou break thy yoke (of obedience), didst thou burst asunder thy bonds, and thou didst say, 'I will not work'." See Ehrlich and Giesebrecht ad loc.

[490] The Q from יחל is impossible (so Giesebrecht). The K is from חול (see Kimhi: אחזני חיל וכאב).

[491] The Q has a vague parallel in the Arabic *wazana*. The K means "lewd" (Delitzsch, Prolegomena p. 73) or "well-nourished" (Kimhi, Ehrlich, and most). See Giesebrecht for references.

[492] This crux interpretum has been variously explained—"assist" (LXX), "leave over an end or remnant" (Tar., Vul., Rashi, Kimhi), "loosen, free" (Dunash, Kimhi), and preferably "strengthen" from שרר (R V). Inasmuch as שָׁרַר is an intransitive verb, it has been proposed to read שָׁרַרְתִּיךְ or הֲשָׁרוֹתֵךְ see BDB, but the change of a verb from intransitive to transitive meets us at times. Cf. Isa 2:21 לַעֲרוֹץ הָאָרֶץ and I Ki 1:6 וְלֹא עֲצָבוֹ אָבִיו. Thus the K can mean "to strengthen". G "Make straight" יְשָׁרַתְּיךְ nearer to Q. Other versions שריתיך from שָׂאַרִית, see Kimhi ad locum.

[493] The K is from יראה (Cf. יצר Isa 44:12; 49:8; Jer 1:5 Q on the form) parallel to יִרְאֶנּוּ.

[494] The Q has the difficulty of one determined (הַיּוֹדֵעַ) and one undetermined noun (וָעֵד). J. D. Michaelis' interpretation of the K as הוא ידע ועד has won general acceptance. Ehrlich's objection is ungrounded.

[495] On this verse see chapter 3. The Q ואשב המה ישבים שם is unintelligible (Ewald et al). The K is to be preferred.

[496] The Q is a nomen gentium but is inferior to the K "drunkards" (cf. Pro 23:20). See Davidson. T סחור סחור eq. מובאים סובבים or סביב. Yet perhaps the K סובאים is taken as equal to סובבים, thus בזא eq. בוז. Saadia likewise works on this theory in his translation of Job.

[497] The K occurs in Jonah 4:11; I Ch 29:7, and is preferred by Hitzig and Ewald. "Though I write ten thousand of my laws, etc." Wellhausen's proposed רֹב תּוֹרָתִי and Graetz's דִּבְרֵי תּוֹרָתִי are both unnecessary and unlikely. The Q is the plural of רֹב which occurs nowhere else. The verse is of great importance in weakening some assumptions of the Higher Criticism. G r. רֹב ותורתי eq. K.

[498] The text is uncertain here, see Baer and Ginsburg. The Q is impossible. The K as vocalized is a Hiphil, though וְאֶעְשָׂר as a Kal is also possible, cf. Hos 12:9; Jb 15:29.

[499] All the varied interpretations and emendations are unsatisfactory. Perhaps the verse can be thus divided: לֹא יִהְיֶה אוֹר // יְקָרוֹת יִקְפָּאוּן where the phrase אוֹר יְקָרוֹת (Cf. יָרַח יָקֹר in Jb 31:26) is divided in the parallel strophes. The verse would then be translated:

"There will be no light,

And the splendors will be congealed." V r. וְקָרוֹת וְקִפָּאוֹן.

[500] The K is taken as Kal perfect (Gesenius, Olsh. Del.) "and she is crushed", as an adjective (Cheyne), "and crushed". Perhaps it can be taken as a noun, a by-form to דַךְ, (cf. קָוֶה קַו) meaning "the poor". The parallelism of the stichs is then improved. The Q is manifestly inferior, making יִדְכָּה, יִשַּׁח, as well as וְנָפַל, verbs with the subject חֲלָלִים. G V link the word to the preceding verse—בִּרְשָׁתּוֹ יִדְכָּה.

[501] נשא נפשׁ occurs in Deut 24:15; Hos 4:8; Ez 24:25 מָשָׂא נַפְשָׁם in the sense of "to long, desire". The K is the only possible reading in our passage. T has double rendering דלא אומי על שקרא לחיבא נפשיה. First half eq. נשׂא נפשׁ ה' hence Q (Cf. Kimhi ad loc.); נַפְשִׁיָּה eq K.

[502] The K is translated by LXX, Vulgate, and occurs in the text of Pro 1:13.

[503] According to the K the words are thus divided: אֱלֹהַי חַסְדּוֹ יְקַדְּמֵנִי parallel to אֱלֹהִים יַרְאֵנִי בְּשׁוֹרְרָי. "My God will send his mercy to meet me, God will show me joy over those who hate me." קדם in the Piel takes both an acc. rei and personae. Cf. Ps 21:4: כי תקדמנו ברכות טוב.

[504] לֹא אֶחָד בָּהֶם is translated "obgleich ihrer keiner noch gekommen war" (Ehrlich) or "before any were formed" (Briggs). The Q is meaningless.

[505] The K וְקֹר רוּחַ is parallel to חוֹשֶׁךְ אֲמָרָיו. It is unanimously preferred.

[506] The K offers a better parallel than the Q to זָר in the opposite stich.

[507] The Q is meaningless. The K is not entirely satisfactory either, some word like תמול before שִׁלְשׁוֹם being apparently necessary. See BDB s. v. and Toy ad loc.

[508] See Ehrlich.

[509] The interpretation of the Q (Ibn Ezra, Rashi) is forced. The K offers a simple sense.

[510] For emendations see Toy ad loc. The Q is difficult. We have vocalised the K as אָו a noun meaning "desire, appetite" from אָוָה like צֹו from צָוָה etc. That some such meaning was necessary was already seen by Hiller and Schultess.

[511] K preferred by Behrmann, Driver-Gray, Ehrlich.

[512] Here as well as in Ecc 9:4 (See Levy ad loc.) the accents follow the K rather than the Q: הלוא מעט ימי יחדל ישית ממני ואבליגה מעט. The Munah links יָמַי to יַחְדֵּל. According to the K the verse is to be translated: "Lo the fewness of my days soon ceases, let him turn from me that I may recover a little". The Q, making both words in question imperative, is awkward and unrhythmical. For a new interpretation of this passage, see Gordis in JQR, NS, 1936, vol. 27, p. 40 f.

[513] The interpretation שיש דין Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, Rashi, Ibn Ezra, Delitzsch, R V, is the best for this difficult passage. See Driver-Gray for the history of the interpretation of this verse. G *hule* eq שַׁדַּי. A: 'judgment"=שִׁדִּין; so, also PVT.

[514] In the vocalization of the K we follow Olsh. Del. Duhm etc, who render תְּשָׂאֵה as equal to תְּשָׂאֶה, and parallel to רוּחַ. The verse is then to be rendered 'Thou liftest me up, making me ride on the wind; and dissolvest me in the roar of the storm". Cf. Beer: Text des B. Hiob, ad loc.

[515] The K ריב is parallel to מכאוב, see Ibn Ezra:

ולפי הכתיב שבזמן המחלה האברים נלחמים זה עם זה.

[516] The K is to be preferred either a) with an Athnach at זְרֹעֶךָ as in MT or b) with the stop at יָשׁוּב so that the second stich reads:

וְזַרְעֲךָ וְגֶרֶנְךָ יֶאֱסֹף

So Merx, Bickell, Buhl, Driver-Gray, Ehrlich.

[517] The only sense is furnished by the K.

[518] The Q occurs in the Targum of Ruth 4:4. Montgomery ad loc. says that the K is right historically, being an old accusative with penultimate accent. He compares עֲלָא Da 6:3.

[519] The K so vocalized by Haevernick, is vouched for by the Ahikar papryi, APO, papyrus 52 col. 1 line 5: עד אחרין יזכרני, and similar usage in Syriac adverbs. (See Nold. Syr. Gram. 155a, Torrey, Notes on the Aramaic of Daniel, and Montgomery ad loc.).

[520] The Q is incomprehensible (Kautzsch). The K is second person, the Q is the third. (See BDB s. v.).

[521] K preferred by Curtis in I.C.C. and generally.

[522] נְצִיבִים in the sense of "garrison" occurs in Ben Sira 46:18 וַיַּכֵּם נְצִיבֵי

צֵר and is preferable to the Q. Thus on II Sa 8:6 נציבים is ren. by אסטרטיניא "garrison". P apparently r. K plus Q.

[523] K preferred by Ehrlich inter alios. Q is meaningless.

[524] See Curtis ad loc.

[525] For a discussion of both readings, see Geiger p. 188 ff. The K: "who did not take her"; the Q: "to whom she was destined". The K and Q are combined by Rashi אשר היה לו להכניסה לו לאשה ולא עשה who follows the Halachah. The Q is rendered by Onkelos, Jerusalem Targum, Vulgate, Ibn Ezra; the K by LXX and Rashbam.

[525a] G omits. Pal. recen. eq. K.

[526] G omits. Pal. eq K. T has doublet, K plus Q בקרחא בעי.

[526a] On the K cf. Gen 27:1 ויהי כי זקן יצחק; on the Q cf. Est 1:10.

[527] Q: "by Him are actions regulated"; the K: "and misdeeds are not tolerated". Cf. Ez 18:25, 29; 33:17, 20 לֹא יְתֻכַּן (So Ehrlich who prefers the K). For another interpretation see Kimhi. G r. וְאֵל תִּכֵּן עֲלִילוֹת.

[528] Driver and H. P. Smith assume an error in the K, yet after the word מגת, ממערות פלשתים would be: "from the Philistine caves".

[529] On the K cf. Deut 32:29 לו חכמו ישכילו זאת. In our passage the apodosis is interrogative. The Q calls for no explanation.

[530] On the form in the K cf. Ps 2:12; 5:12 and P. Churgin: לתולדות הנפרד in *Ner Maarabi* vol. II, for one view of this construction. See Ges-K 130, 1 for the normal position on this question.

[531] On the K cf. Ex 2:22.

[532] The Q means "a brick-mould". See BDB for cognates in later Hebrew, Arabic, and Syriac, and compare Hoffman in ZATW 1882 p. 53 ff. The Q is preferred by Driver. The K may be vocalized מִלְכָּן as a by-form to מִלְכָּם (Cf. Robertson-Smith: Religion of the Semites p. 67). Geiger p. 306 proposes בְּמַלְכָּן (sc. שֶׁל הָעֲרִים) meaning "David passed them through to their King (Molech)". References to העביר למולך are plentiful in the Bible. The K is preferred by H. P. Smith.

[533] More than one shield-bearer is possible, as the ranks were refilled after battle. See H. P. Smith ad loc.

[534] נא often strengthens the jussive. See Ges-K 109, 1.

[535] On the position of לא cf. Gen 3:4. The K is: "You will not live, for God has shown me, etc." (On this Vav of concomitant condition cf. BDB s. v. I k). The Q makes the Vav adversative. Barnes prefers the K; most authorities, the Q.

[536] K is translated by Lucian, Vulgate. Cf. the parallel in II Ch 25:23 וַיְבִאֻהוּ.

[537] For the anticipatory suffix in the K, so common in Aramaic, cf. Ex 2:6.

[538] The K is from נדא, a parallel to נדה, cf. Ethiopic *nada'* "to drive cattle." Similar are בדה and בדא.

[539] The K is preferred by Lumby; the Q by Burney. עיר and חצר are parallel in Isa 42:11.

[540] The K may be interpreted: "and I shall bring low, like a mighty one, its inhabitants", or the Kaph may be taken as a Kaph veritatis or asseverative Kaph ,which does not affect the translation: "I shall surely lay low the strongest of its inhabitants." On this Kaph see Ges-K 118, 6d, many of whose examples are doubtful. Besides those quoted there, we add Hos 4:4; Ps 87:7; 119:7; Jb 3:5, La 1:20. Fuller discussion of this Kaph including possible evidence from Ras-Shamra Inscriptions, must be reserved for another occasion.

[541] For K cf. Isa 2:2; Jer 26:18; Mi 3:12; II Ch 33:15; on the Q cf. Isa 1:8; 16:1; 62:11 et al.

[542] פֶּרֶק means "a fragment or joint of the body", cf. Arakin 19b עד הפרק and other references in Jastrow s. v. The Q occurs elsewhere.

[543] On the interchange of Vav between K and Q here cf. II Sa 22:41 מְשַׂנְאַי and its parallel Ps 18:41 וְאַצְמִיתֵם וּמְשַׂנְאַי אַצְמִיתֵם (Driver).

[544] This verse has been variously interpreted. The K is differently adopted by Driver, Duhm, Ehrlich; the KQ by the Medieval Jewish commentators and Delitzsch. See Driver-Gray ICC on Job vol. II ad loc. for the history of the interpretation. Beer (op. cit.) restores the text underlying the Greek thus: הֵן יִקְטְלֵנִי אֵל וְהֵיחֵל.

[545] See Chapter III on conflate texts. The K is a combination of שָׁמֵם and הָשֵׁם as is the K in Ecc 6:10.

[546] See note above. Our view seems preferable to that of Delitzsch (Margolis).

[547] The K is preferred by Bevan.

[548] On the K cf. Ez 3:3; the Q means "rebuild."

[549] In most cases the K contains obvious errors of omission, dittography, scribal metathesis, wrongly inserted vowel letters, or confusion of similar letters.

[549a] G r. אִמְרוּ אֶל substantiating K. Pal. follows Q.

[550] For the K cf. ch. III on conflates, where this passage is discussed.

[550a] G is indeterminate.

[551] Klosterman offered the root עוּשׁ of uncertain meaning, occurring in Joel 4:11 and in the proper name יְעוּשׁ for the K. See Driver ad loc.

[552] The Q is parallel to הִישִׁב.

[553] The K is influenced by I Ki 12:3; the Q refers back to v. 18.

[554] Ehrlich assumes as the original: לְסוֹבֵב יַעֲקֹב אֵלָיו וְיִשְׂרָאֵל לָאֱסוֹף. G (B) P r. וישראל אֶאֱסוֹף thus preserving the Aleph of K.

[555] Cf. Behrmann ad loc. The Q seems preferable. Ehrlich's elaborate explanation is overelaborate.

[556] Ehrlich corrects the K את אשר into האל אשר because proper names are not normally modified by adjective or clause directly. Hence, never אני ה'

משה האיש: Ex 32:1 אני ה' אלהיכם אשר but always אשר הוצאתי Cf. also Ju 3:15 אֲהוּד אִישׁ אִטַּר I Ki 11:32, 36; 14:21; passim, ירושלים העיר.

557 See Kimhi who identifies the K with פִּתְבָּג of Daniel meaning: "food".

558 The Q is superior rhythmically.

559 The Q is vocalized עֲוֹנוֹתָם by Graetz, Nowack, Haupt, etc. On K cf. Zech 5:6; Ps 73:7 where עין is emended to עון, perhaps unnecessarily.

560 On Q cf. Amos 9:5. The K may be a case of assimilated Ain, though this is doubted by Ges-K p. 64. Cf. the particle בִּי for בְּעִי and Jos 19:3 בָּלָה a place name, for בַּעֲלָה.

561 Cf. Kimhi יחייב מיחה לבוא עליו.

561a V r. K, see chap. V.

562 See Toy for the variety of meanings.

563 See the varying interpretations of Ibn Ezra and Ehrlich, both of whom accept the Q.

564 The K occurs only once, Pro 3:12. The Q is common—3:1; 4:13; 6:20. See Toy.

565 See Ibn Ezra, Rashi and BDB for plausible interpretations of the K.

566 The accents seem to follow the K. See L. Levy: Koheleth, Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Sadduzaeismus, ad loc.

567 On the privative Niphal cf. יִזָּמֵר Isa 5:6 and Kimhi at our passage.

568 The K is taken as a noun on the order of מְלוּכָה, יְשׁוּעָה by Stier und Theile: Hand Polyglotten, appendix ad loc.

569 Cf. מַלְכִים in Ezra 4:13 where no KQ occurs. Perhaps a future inscription will remove this example also from the list of supposed Hebraisms, as has happened in the case of אלה and other instances.

570 Cf. Del. Schreib- und, 95a end, who accepts neither K nor Q. G "bear out" eq. K וְאוֹצְאָה. V "misi" eq. K?

571 The K may contain an indirect object or an ethical dative suffix, cf. Jud. 1:15 נְתָתָנִי and Ecc 2:21. יִתְּנֶנּוּ. The K would mean: "er stellte sich seine Turen auf." G (B) has a homeoteleuton from יבננו הוא v. 14 (misread as הוא ובניו) to יבננו הוא v. 15, and then r. ויעמידו as a plural. P likewise r. the K as a plural.

572 We expect לָהּ.

573 We do not expect to learn at this juncture that he is a Calebite. The K is impossible.

574 See ch. III on conflates for the K. The Q is an "Unform".

575 The passage is corrupt and unintelligible. GPV "hating" eq. שְׂנָאַי or שָׂנְאוּ.

575a The passage is corrupt. V "venerunt igitur qui vicerant" eq. וַיָּכוּ בָא. T eq. Q. P eq. וַיָּבוֹ בָהּ eq. K. G eq. וַיָּבוֹ בָא וְהַכּוֹת substantiating K.

576 The construct infinitive is emended to מַהֲרִבּוֹת by Thenius, Gesenius, Driver.

[577] The text is now normally reconstructed as follows: הִגְדַּלְתָּ הַגִּילָא הִגְדַּלְתָּ הַשְׁמָהָה. This was erroneously dissociated into הגי לא, then into הַגוּי לֹא and then "corrected" by the Q into הַגּוֹי לוֹ. This view of the passage was first broached by W. Selwyn in his Horae Hebraicae (1848).

[578] לם is probably a dittography from שלם of the preceding verse, so Graetz, Cheyne, Kittel, Buhl, Marti, Ehrlich. See also Behrmann, Or Bahir, ad loc.

[578a] The passage is corrupt and unintelligible.

[579] The word in question is corrected by Cornill to הָאִתִּיוֹן. LXX apparently read הַחִיצוֹן.

[580] The word is usually emended to לְשִׁמְאוֹל. See Ginsburg, Ehrlich and BDB.

[581] According to Curtis, certain names fell out of the genealogy.

[582] So Klostermann.

[583] So Jahn and partially Kraeling.

[584] See Ehrlich's brilliant suggestion that the first half of the verse read: רוֹעֶה רַבִּים יַרְעֵם, to which came the second: מְרַדְּדִים אֲמָרִים לֹא לוֹ הָמָה.

[585] So Baer, Genesis p. 84. Ben Naphtali vocalizes יְשָׁכָר equals אִישׁ שָׂכָר; Ginsburg vocalizes יֵשׁ שָׂכָר. See Norzi.

[585a] G seems to read: רַבָּה הַמִּשְׁרָה. Aquila: הַמִּשְׁרָה!

[586] The Q occurs in Jos 19:33. Th r. בִּצַּעֲנִים. G (A) r. בְּשַׁאֲנַנִּים.

[586a] P יונת should be נוית, hence K. G "dwelling" נָוֶה eq. K. Other Greek Mss. r. *Anath.*

[586b] G r. שַׁחַץ יָמָה substantiating Q. PC r. Q.

[586c] G r. גּוֹלָן. PC has our vocalization as well.

[587] The Q occurs only here. On the K cf. Deut 11:29 הַר גְּרִזִים et al. A r. *Zegri* for which r. *Gezri* eq. Q.

[588] Q occurs in Nu 1:10 et al. K only here.

[589] The name occurs as שְׁוָא K, שָׁוְא Q, שְׂרָיָה II Sa 8:17, שַׁוְשָׁא I Ch 18:16, שִׁישָׁא I Ki 4:3.

[590] Besides the KQ here, the KQ occurs as אַרְנִיָּה in the K of II Sa 24:18 and as אָרְנָן in I Ch 1:21.

[591] The K is given by LXX and Vulgate. Both forms are correct. Beth and Mem interchange. Cf. בָּשָׁן and מתנן in Aramaic (e. g. in the Targum to Nahum 1:4) and תֵּמָנָה, *Tibneh* in modern Arabic (See BDB s. v.) and בְּנָיְמִין and מְנָיְמִין (See Geiger, Urschrift p. 221 note).

[592] Burney p. 334: The K probably denotes the two Sippars and hence we expect the dual סְפָרַיִם.

[593] The K occurs as the name of an Egyptian princess identified with Daphne. Cf. Ramses serving as the name of a city. The Q occurs in Jer 43:7, 8, 9, et al and in Ez 30:18 in a slightly different form: תְּחַפְנְחֵס. P: ותחפיס for which read ותחפנס (Syriac Yod and Nun being very similar) = K!

[594] The Q is a shorter form of the K. The stages may be set down as follows

1) מִיכָיְהוּ (Ju 17:14) 2) מִיכָיְה 3) מִיכָה. Cf. also 1) שְׁמַעְיְהוּ (II Ch 11:2), 2) שְׁמַעְיָה (II Ch 12:5, 7), 3) שְׁמָעָא or שְׁמָעִי 4) שְׁמַי. Cf. J. Dérenbourg: Essai sur la Palestine (Hebrew translation, Petrograd 1896 p. 45 note 2) and B. Lazeknick in שפתנו #2, 1923 p. 83 on the shortening of Hebrew names. Though many of the latter's conclusions must be treated with care, a great deal of pertinent matter is there assembled.

[594a] G (B) *Aloth* eq. K because of the Holem Vav. S: "paved with slabs" eq. K הַלְחוֹת. G (א) *Aleth* eq. Q: הלחית.

[595] See Baer's ed. at Ezra 2:1, on the various forms of the name.

[596] The K occurs in Ps 77:1; Neh 11:37; I Ch 16:28.

[597] Cf. Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum, II, 1, p. 122: חשיארש.

[597a] GVP r. *IDITHUN*, *idithoun*, ידיתום respectively, all with yod after Daled, even where the text reads ידותון, with Vav, as in 62:1.

[598] On the K cf. I Ki 4:5.

[599] On K see I Ch 8:14; 13:4; on Q as a place name, cf. Jos 21:38.

[599a] G r. K as וַעֲשׂוּ.

[600] On K cf. I Ch 27:21.

[601] On K cf. Ezra 10:28; on Q Ezra 2:9.

[602] On K cf. הוֹדַוְיָה Ezra 2:40; on Q cf. I Ch 4:19, הוֹדִיָה

[602a] GV with Holem in the first syllable, hence K נפושסים.

[602b] G (אA) *basaloth* eq. K. G (B) r. *basaoth*, which correct to *basloth* eq. K (an uncial error), Lambda and Alpha being similar.

[603] The K occurs in Ez 2:52; the Q nowhere else.

[603a] P יתרון error for יתדון, in turn an error for ידתון.

[604] On K cf. יְצָחָק, יַעֲקֹב as parallel to יְצָהָר; on Q cf. Gen 23:8.

[605] The Q occurs as a name of a people in II Ch 26:7 (see Jud 10:12) and G. F. Moore ad loc. P r. הַמַּעְיָנִים "wells" eq. K! G *Minaios* eq. K? V "habitatores", T מדורי may also go back to מעונים, from מָעוֹן, "dwelling-place."

[606] Cf. the first part of note 604, for the K.

[607] The K occurs in the text in 24:22. The Q is the name of a famous queen of later times.

[608] The K occurs in Gen 23:9; the Q is a hapax legomenon.

[760] G read חסרו.

[761] G V read מַחְשֶׁבֶת ה' as a singular.

[762] The additional example strengthens our attempt to make out a case for the noun הַיָה by the side of הַוָה. See List 29 and note 134.

[763] Vss seem to read an infinitive וְסָפוֹן.

[764] The renderings of these synonyms in GPTVS ("share in") make a decision as to the underlying reading impossible. This KQ is quoted in Sanh. 20a.

[765] For the word in question G r. "and branches and" eq. . . . וסבך ן or . . וסכך ו (*radamnois*), hence either יסבהו or יסכהו.

[768] K Md is an absolute error. For a possible defence of the K Maar cf. note 205. The K Md is valuable however in testifying to the existence of another reading; it is in fact no more than a sub-variant to the K Maar.

[769] P r. בַּכְּפָרִים or בִּכְפָרִים. GV indeterminate as both words mean "villages".

[770] Th transliterates *sis* (K Md) r. "a pent-up swallow", perhaps a mishearing of סוס ענור as סוּס סָנוּר!

[771] K may be Qal against Hophal of Q, or a scribal error.

[772] A, Th, V tr. אֲעִירֵנוּ or אֲעוֹרֵנוּ? P: נתחעיר perhaps interpreting "will arouse himself" i. e. will be aroused.

[773] T יתבי eq. Q Md. The singular is expressed by יתב; cf. vv. 9, 17.

[774] The K may agree with בָּקָר which is feminine plural in Jb 1:14. Cf. also Wellhausen and Driver on 1 Samuel 8:16, where G read בְּקַרְכֶם for MT בָּחוּרֵיכֶם with a plural masculine adjective (הטובים).

[775] The K apparently is feminine referring like Maar to עיר; the Q is masc., referring to עֹשֶׁק.

[776] The Q and Maar refer to the general condition—"this is your lot". The K refers to אִשָּׁה.

[777] Tar. חבריה דכותיה דדמי ליה eq. K Md.

[779] P "will testify" V "sustain" eq. יְעִידֵנִי cf. אֲעִידֵךְ La 2:13 and note 308. G "will resist me". Likewise a first person suffix.

[780] The form הארון of the K with the article occurs in 3:14 with no variant. Tar follows Q Md in our passage and translates 3:17 ארון קימא, while v. 14 is rendered ארונא דקימא.

[781] This Kethib-vela-Qere is mentioned in B Nedarim 37b.

[782] G reads "throw off".

[783] Tar: דאתמסרו לתבר exactly as in 32:32 where text is נתתי אתן חתיתו, an example of assimilation in translating. G is eq. to MT exactly.

[784] On Tar: see Rashi ad loc.

[785] T combines here both K and Q of Mad, substantiating the tradition that ascribes the Targum to Rab Joseph. See Ch. VI for a full discussion. On the variant itself, it seems to have arisen from a confusion of Heth and Ayin in speech, exactly as in the long list of variants in the Samaritan Pentateuch collected by Heller, op. cit. p. 6 note 5.

[786] *Bethaun* which Origen writes suh asterisko, is patently K Md. Field was unaware of the Mad reading and equates it with בֵּית אֵל!

[787] G (B) reads *Segor*.

[788] P reads Q Md בְּנֵי.

[789] G (A) *Iellai* eq. Maar. P from above reads חורי. T and V read Holem at the end, eq. Q Md.

INDEX OF KETHIB-QERE PASSAGES

Note: The numbers refer to the lists in the major Classification.

Genesis

4:18.....85
8:17.....49
9:21..... 4
10:19..... 6
12:8..... 4
13:3..... 4
14:2..... 6
14:8..... 6
20:6..... 8
24:14.....38
24:16.....38
24:28.....38
24:33.....60
24:55.....38
24:57.....38
25:23..... 6
27:3.....42
27:29..... 7
30:11.....80
30:18.....85
33:4.....3a
34:3.....38
34:12.....38
35:21..... 4
36:5.....35
36:14.....35
39:20.....34
43:28..... 7
49:11..... 4
49:11..... 4

Exodus

4:2..... 8
16:2.....56
16:7.....56
21:8.....81
22:4..... 4
22:26..... 4
27:11.....3a
28:28.....3a
32:19.....3a
32:27..... 4
35:11.....3a
37:8.....42
39:4.....42
39:33.....3a

Leviticus

9:22.....3a
11:21.....82
16:21.....3a
21:5.....82
23:13..... 4
25:30.....83

Numbers

1:16.....35
3:51..... 8
10:36..... 4
11:32.....3c
12:3.....3c
14:36.....56
16:11.....56
21:32.....56
26:9.....34
32:7.....56
34:4.....18

Deuteronomy

2:33.....3a
5:10.....82
7:9.....3a
8:2.....3a
21:7.....18
22:15.....38
22:16.....38
22:20.....38
22:21.....38
22:23.....38
22:24.....38
22:25.....38
22:26.....38
22:27.....38
22:28.....38
22:29.....38
27:10.....3a
28:27..... 2
28:30..... 2
29:22..... 6
32:13.....31
33:2.....11
33:9.....3a

Joshua

2:13.....42
3:4.....3b
3:16.....71
4:18.....71
5:1.....67
6:5.....71
6:7.....82
6:9.....55
6:13.....55
7:21.....51
8:11.....3b
8:12.....81
8:16.....81
9:7.....30
9:7.....63
11:16..... 4
15:4.....18
15:35..... 4
15:47.....82
15:48..... 4
15:50..... 4
15:50..... 4
15:63.....55
16:3.....3a
17:18.....18
18:12.....18
18:14.....18
18:19.....18
18:24.....85
19:22.....85
19:29.....74
20:8.....85
21:10.....42
21:27.....85
22:7.....71
24:3.....50
24:8.....53
24:15.....71

Judges

1:27..... 8
4:11.....85
5:7.....15
6:5.....73
7:13.....34
7:21.....57
9:8.....22
9:12.....22
9:49..... 4
11:37.....42
13:17.....61
13:18.....42
16:18.....82
16:21.....35
16:25.....35
16:25.....81
16:26.....33
17:2.....15
17:2.....15
19:3.....65
19:21.....60
19:25.....71
20:13.....78
21:20..... 7
21:22.....45

I Samuel

2:3.....81
2:9.....3a
2:10.....3a
2:10.....3b
2:16.....84
3:2.....3a
3:18.....3a
4:13.....82
5:6..... 2
5:9..... 2
5:12..... 2
6:4..... 2
6:5..... 2
7:9..... 8
8:3.....3a
9:1.....10
9:26.....70
10:7.....60
10:21.....3a
11:6.....71
11:9.....71
12:10..... 8
13:8.....56
13:19..... 8
14:27.....82
14:32.....77
14:32.....82
15:16.....82
17:7.....82
17:23.....81
18:1.....60

18:6.....45
18:7.....3a
18:9.....28
18:14.....3a
18:22.....3a
19:18.....85
19:19.....85
19:22.....85
19:23.....85
19:23.....85
20:1.....85
20:2.....81
20:2.....81
20:24.....41
20:38.....42
21:12.....3a
21:12.....3a
22:13.....3b
22:15.....30
22:17.....82
22:18.....26
22:18.....26
22:22.....26
23:5.....3a
24:5.....61
24:9.....32
24:19.....13
25:3.....83
25:18.....20
25:18.....36
25:31.....30
25:34.....83
26:5.....3b
26:7.....3b
26:7.....3b
26:11.....3b
26:16.....3b
26:22.....82
27:4.....56
27:8.....85
28:8.....22
29:5.....3a
29:5.....3a
30:6.....3a
30:24.....82

II Samuel

1:8.....82
1:11.....3a
1:16.....61
2:23.....3b
3:2.....56
3:3.....12
3:12.....3b
3:15.....46
3:25.....42
5:2..... 7
5:2..... 9
5:8.....83
5:24.....71
8:3.....78
10:9.....81
11:1.....80
11:24.....43
12:9.....67
12:20.....3a
12:22.....73
12:24.....81
12:31.....81
13:8.....54
13:24.....3a
13:32.....47
13:33.....76
13:37.....85
14:7.....45
14:11.....83
14:19.....42
14:22.....66
14:30.....82
15:8.....83
15:20.....57
15:21.....76
15:28.....80
16:2.....82
16:8.....3b
16:8.....3b
16:10.....80
16:10.....80
16:12.....80
16:18.....82
16:23.....78
17:12.....64
18:3.....57
18:8.....61
18:12..... 5
18:13.....80
18:17.....80
18:18.....3a
18:20.....78
19:7..... 5
19:19.....3a
19:32.....82
19:41.....73
20:5.....56
20:8.....3b
20:14.....33
20:23.....80
20:25.....85
21:4.....61
21:6.....56
21:9..... 7
21:9.....70
21:9.....82
21:12..... 9
21:12.....44
21:16.....85
21:20.....80
21:21.....85
22:8.....56
22:15.....80
22:23.....3a
22:33.....67
22:34.....67
22:51.....80
23:8.....64
23:8.....85
23:9.....3b
23:9..... 7
23:9.....85
23:13.....82
23:18.....80
23:20.....42
23:20.....82
23:21.....83
23:35.....85
23:37.....81
24:14.....3a
24:16.....85
24:18.....85
24:22.....3a

I Kings

1:27.....61
1:37.....50
1:47.....81
2:24.....60
4:7.....77
5:17.....80
6:5.....34
6:16.....42
6:21.....35
6:38.....3a
7:20.....77
7:23.....42
7:36.....82
7:45.....80
8:26.....61
8:48..... 8
9:9..... 7
9:18.....80
10:2.....12
10:5.....3a
12:3.....63
12:7..... 8
12:12..... 8
12:21.....82
12:33.....82
14:2.....15
14:25.....85
15:15.....80
15:18.....77
16:16.....61
16:34.....35
17:14.....55
17:15.....65
17:15.....65
18:36.....61
18:42.....3a
19:4.....64
20:33..... 9
20:41.....42
21:8.....77
21:21..... 7
21:29..... 8
22:13.....61
22:49.....84
22:49.....18

II Kings

2:16.....42
3:24.....83
4:2.....16
4:3.....16
4:5.....49
4:7.....16
4:7.....16
4:16.....15
4:23.....15
4:23.....17
4:34.....3a
5:12.....85
5:18.....81
5:25.....42
6:10..... 4
6:25..... 2
7:12.....32
7:13.....77
7:15.....56
8:1.....15
8:10.....81
8:17.....69
9:15.....32
9:25..... 4
9:33.....82
9:37.....19
10:27..... 2
11:1.....75
11:2.....56
11:4.....26
11:9.....26
11:10.....26
11:15.....26
11:18.....3a
11:20.....77
12:10.....71
12:12.....56
12:12.....61
13:6..... 7
14:2..... 12
14:6.....56
14:7.....77
14:12.....80
14:13.....81
15:25.....77
16:6.....80
16:15.....81
16:17.....82
16:18.....49
17:13.....80
17:16.....69
17:21.....81
17:24.....70
17:31..... 8
17:31.....85

18:27..... 2
18:27..... 2
19:13..... 4
19:23.....82
19:31.....78
19:37.....78
20:4.....81
20:13..... 4
20:18..... 7
21:12.....65
22:5..... 8
22:5.....70
23:4.....20
23:10.....61
23:33.....71
23:36.....35
24:10.....63
24:14.....69
24:15.....46
24:18.....36
25:12.....80
25:17.....69

Isaiah

3:15..... 8
3:16.....20
5:29.....73
9:2.....83
9:6.....83
10:6.....47
10:13.....81
10:13.....35
10:32.....81
12:5.....49
13:16..... 2
15:3..... 4
16:3.....67
16:3.....67
18:4.....21
23:12.....37
23:13.....35
25:10.....80
26:20.....61
28:15..... 7
28:15.....48
29:11.....77
30:5.....41
30:6.....28
30:32.....65
30:33.....65
32:7.....39
32:15.....77
36:12..... 2
36:12..... 2
36:20.....30
37:30.....55
39:2..... 4
41:23.....50
42:20.....55
42:24.....58
44:17.....30
44:24.....80
45:2.....49
46:11.....66
47:13.....55
49:5.....82
49:6.....35
49:13.....73
52:2.....82
55:5.....3a
54:16.....42
55:13.....72
56:10.....3a
57:19.....46
58:14.....31
60:21.....82
62:3.....34
63:9.....82
65:4.....81
65:7.....41
66:17.....65

Jeremiah

1:5.....31
2:3..... 4
2:15.....18
2:16.....85
2:20.....15
2:20.....80
2:21..... 4
2:24.....64
2:25.....82
2:27.....67
2:33.....15
3:2..... 2
3:4.....15
3:5.....15
3:7.....51
3:19.....67
3:19.....67
3:19.....67
4:5.....72
4:19.....15
4:19.....80
4:30.....15
5:7.....30
5:8.....80
5:24.....72
6:7.....46
6:21.....73
6:25.....67
6:25.....67
6:29.....11
7:22..... 8
8:1.....75
8:6..... 4
8:6.....61
8:7.....46
8:10..... 4
9:7.....55
10:13..... 7
10:17.....17
13:16.....72
13:20.....67
13:20.....67
14:3.....34
14:14.....34
14:14.....42
15:4.....33
15:8.....3a
15:9.....64
15:10..... 4
15:11.....80
15:16.....61
16:16.....28
17:8.....80
17:10.....3a
17:11.....3a
17:13.....42
17:19.....77
17:23.....55
17:24.....64
18:3.....42
18:10.....42
18:15.....34
18:16.....34
18:22.....48
18:23.....74
19:2.....42
19:15..... 7
20:7..... 4
21:9.....73
21:12.....67
22:4.....3a
22:6.....18
22:18..... 4
22:23.....17
22:23.....17
23:18.....67
24:9.....33
25:7.....82
26:6.....42
26:18.....85
28:1.....69
29:14.....40
29:18.....33
29:23.....80
31:21.....15
31:38.....78
31:39.....42
31:40.....82
32:1.....69
32:4.....3a
32:23.....61
32:35..... 7
33:8.....30
33:26.....40
34:11.....56
34:17.....33
35:13.....60
37:4.....35
37:19.....42
38:2.....73
38:11.....77
38:16.....82
39:12.....76
39:16..... 7
40:3.....77
40:8.....85
40:16.....50
41:17.....85
42:6.....42
42:20.....82
43:10.....34
43:11.....82
46:11.....15
48:4.....34
48:5..... 5
48:7.....35
48:7.....42
48:18.....49
48:20.....67
48:20.....67
48:21.....49
48:27.....64
48:31..... 4
48:38..... 4
48:44.....57
49:25.....19
49:28.....85
49:30.....67
49:36.....82
49:39.....40
50:6.....18
50:6.....82
50:8.....49
50:11.....67
50:11.....67
50:11.....67
50:11.....67
50:15.....42
50:29.....78
50:44.....57
51:3.....79
51:13.....17
51:34.....67
51:34.....67
51:34.....67
51:34.....67
52:1.....36
52:11.....70
52:21.....82
52:31.....35
52:32.....77
52:33.....3a

Ezekiel

1:8.....82
3:15.....80
3:20.....3a
4:6.....42
4:15.....34
6:3.....42
6:17.....26

6:18.....26
7:2.....64
7:13.....26
7:21..... 7
7:24.....26
8:6..... 8
9:4.....3b
9:5.....61
9:5.....82
9:11.....81
11:15..... 4
12:14..... 4
14:4.....27
14:4.....83
14:20.....27
16:13.....15
16:13.....42
16:18.....15
16:20.....61
16:22.....15
16:25.....61
16:31.....15
16:31.....15
16:43.....15
16:43.....15
16:47.....15
16:51.....15
16:51.....61
16:53.....40
16:59..... 8
17:21.....3a
18:14.....50
18:20.....77
18:21.....3a
18:24.....3a
18:28.....54
20:40..... 4
21:28.....30
22:18.....46
23:14.....37
23:16.....52
23:42.....80
23:43.....83
23:43.....83
24:2.....30
25:7.....82
25:9.....12
27:3.....17
27:15.....31
28:3.....27
29:4.....42
29:7.....82
30:16.....47
31:5.....3a
31:18..... 4
32:31..... 4
32:32..... 4
32:32.....67
33:13.....3a
33:16.....3a
34:25.....42
35:9.....49
35:12.....58
36:10..... 4
36:13.....15
36:13.....61
36:14.....61
36:14.....57
36:15.....61
37:16.....3a
37:16.....3a
37:19.....3a
37:22.....63
39:11..... 4
39:25.....40
40:6.....3a
40:9.....3a
40:15.....83
40:21.....3a
40:21.....3a
40:21.....3a
40:22.....3a
40:22.....3a
40:22.....3a
40:22.....3a
40:24.....3a
40:24.....3a
40:25.....3a
40:26.....3a
40:26.....3a
40:29.....3a
40:29.....3a
40:29.....3a
40:29.....3a
40:31.....3a
40:31.....3a
40:31.....3a
40:33.....3a
40:33.....3a
40:33.....3a
40:33.....3a
40:34.....3a
40:34.....3a
40:34.....3a
40:36.....3a
40:36.....3a
40:36.....3a
40:37.....3a
40:37.....3a
40:37.....3a
41:8.....49
41:15.....34
42:9..... 9
42:9.....58
42:14.....73
42:16.....84
43:11.....3a
43:11.....3a
43:15.....42
43:16.....42
43:26.....3a
44:3.....30
44:5.....3a
44:24.....82
44:24.....82
45:3.....64
45:5.....73
46:9.....82
46:15.....73
46:19.....12
47:10.....73
47:11.....3a
47:12.....63
48:14.....57
48:15..... 4
48:16.....79
48:18..... 4
48:21..... 4

Hosea

6:10.....35
8:12.....30
8:12.....80
9:16.....42
10:10.....82
11:8..... 6
13:2..... 4

Joel

4:1.....40

Amos

8:4.....39
8:8.....82
9:6.....3a

Obadiah

1:11.....3a

Micah

1:3.....31
1:8.....49
1:10.....55
3:2.....42
4:13.....15

Nahum

1:3.....30
2:1.....30
2;1..... 4
2:6.....34
3:3.....73

Habakkuk

1:9..... 4
1:15..... 4
3:4..... 4
3:14.....3a

Zephaniah

2:7.....40
2:7.....81

Haggai

1:7.....52

Zechariah

1:4.....42
1:16.....42
2:8.....3b
4:2.....82
11:2.....34
11:5.....80
14:2..... 2
14:6.....80

Psalms

5:9.....49
6:4.....13
9:13.....39
9:19.....39
10:5.....3a
10:9..... 4
10:10.....11
10:10.....80
10:12.....39
11:1.....67
14:21.....39
16:10.....67
17:11.....67
17:14.....35
21:2.....30
22:14.....30
24:4.....80
24:6.....3a
26:2.....22
27:5..... 4
30:4.....80
38:21.....31
39:1.....85
41:3.....73
42:9..... 4
49:15.....48
51:4.....51
54:7.....57
55:16.....82
56:7.....57
58:8.....3a
59:11.....80
59:16.....57
60:7.....67
66:7.....57

71:12.....48
71:20.....67
71:20.....67
71:20.....67
72:17.....56
73:2.....18
73:2.....55
73:10.....57
73:16.....65
74:6..... 8
74:11.....46
77:1.....85
77:12.....57
77:20.....61
79:10..... 6
85:2.....40
89:18.....57
89:29.....30
90:8.....14
92:16.....42
100:3.....82
101:5.....31
102:24.....82
105:18.....61
105:28.....61
105:40.....3c
106:45.....3a
108:7.....67
119:79.....55
119:147.....61
119:161.....61
123:4.....11
126:4.....40
129:3.....61
139:6.....42
139:16.....80
140:10.....62
140:11.....57
140:13..... 8
145:6.....61
145:8.....30
147:19.....3a
148:2.....3a

PROVERBS

1:27.....42
2:7.....73
2:8.....3a
3:15.....42
3:27.....61
3:28.....42
3:30.....45
3:34.....39
4:16.....57
6:13.....3a
6:13.....3a
6:14.....42
6:16.....61
8:17.....82
8:35.....55
11:3.....73
12:14.....57
13:20.....81
13:20.....81
14:21.....39
15:14.....82
16:19.....39
16:27.....61
17:13.....56
17:27.....80
18:17.....73
18:19.....42
19:7.....84
19:16.....57
19:19.....82
20:4.....73
20:16.....80
20:20.....42
20:21.....41
20:30.....58
21:9.....42
21:19.....42
21:29.....61
21:29.....81
22:3.....74
22:8.....30
22:11.....30
22:14.....30
22:20.....80
22:25.....3a
23:5.....57
23:5.....80
23:24.....45
23:24.....81
23:24.....81
23:26.....82
23:29.....42
23:31.....48
24:17.....61
25:24.....42
26:2.....80
26:21.....42
26:24.....61
27:10.....42
27:15.....42
27:20.....42
27:24.....72
28:8.....70
28:16.....17
30:10.....3a
30:18.....64
31:4.....80
31:16..... 8
31:18.....42
31:18.....42
31:27.....49

JOB

1:10.....13
2:7.....72
5:18.....3a
6:2.....29
6:20.....82
7:1.....42
7:5.....48
9:13.....3b
9:30.....80
10:20.....80
10:20.....80
13:15.....81
14:5.....3a
15:15.....3a
15:22.....20
15:31..... 8
16:16 18
19:29.....80
20:11.....3a
21:13.....41
21:20.....3a
24:1.....3a
24:6.....57
26:12.....82
26:14.....3a
26:14.....3a
27:15.....3a
30:11.....82
30:22.....80
31:11.....65
31:11.....65
31:20.....3a
33:19.....80
33:21.....58
33:28.....67
37:12.....3a
38:1.....11
38:12..... 9
38:41.....3a
39:12.....80
39:26.....3a
39:30.....3a
40:6.....11
40:17.....3a
41:4.....80
42:2..... 8
42:10.....40
42:16.....50

CANTICLES

1:17.....41
2:11.....3c
2:13.....16
2:14.....61
4:9.....64

RUTH

1:8.....51
2:1.....49
3:3.....15
3:3.....61
3:4.....15
3:5.....78
3:12.....76
3:14.....3b
3:14.....42
3:17.....78
4:4.....52
4:5.....82
4:6.....30

LAMENTATIONS

1:6.....32
1:11.....42
1:18.....77
2:2.....72
2:13.....56
2:14.....40
2:19.....42
3:10.....42
3:20.....57
3:25.....3a
3:39.....3a
4:3.....10
4:3.....42
4:12.....72
4:16.....72
4:17.....65
4:21.....17
5:1.....52
5:3.....72
5:5.....72
5:7.....72
5:7.....72
5:18.....81
5:21.....52

ECCLESIASTES

4:8.....61
4:17.....61
5:8.....65
5:10.....35
6:10.....81
7:22.....13
9:4.....82
10:3.....77
10:20.....77
11:9.....61
12:6.....82

ESTHER

1:5.....82
1:16.....85
3:4.....71
4:4.....60
4:7.....37
8:1.....37
8:7.....37
8:13.....34
8:13.....37
9:15.....37
9:18.....37
9:19.....42
9:26..... 8
10:1.....85

DANIEL

1:4.....42
2:4.....24
2:5.....26
2:9.....56
2:10.....26
2:22.....35
2:26.....25
2:29.....23
2:29.....24
2:31.....23
2:33.....68
2:37.....23
2:38.....27
2:38.....23
2:39.....26
2:39.....80
2:40.....26
2:41.....68
2:42.....68
2:43.....72
3:3.....27
3:5.....42
3:7.....42
3:10.....42
3:10.....23
3:10.....42
3:12.....24
3:12.....25
3:15.....42
3:18.....25
3:18.....24
3:19.....62
3:21.....42
3:23.....26
3:25.....26
3:26.....26
3:27.....61
3:28.....61
3:29.....82
3:31.....27
3:32.....26
4:4.....26
4:4.....59
4:5.....80
4:9.....68
4:13.....42
4:14.....42
4:14.....25
4:14.....26
4:15.....23
4:15.....81
4:16.....24
4:16.....24
4:16.....42
4:16.....81
4:19.....23
4:19.....80
4:21.....42
4:21.....26
4:21.....82
4:22.....26
4:24.....24
4:24.....24
4:26.....25
4:29.....25
4:29.....26
4:31.....26
4:32.....27
5:5.....68
5:7.....26
5:7.....42
5:8.....59
5:10.....24
5:10.....59
5:13.....23
5:14.....25
5:16.....42
5:16.....25
5:16.....82
5:18.....23
5:18.....26
5:19.....27
5:21.....25
5:21.....26
5:21.....57
5:22.....23
5:23.....23
5:23.....24
5:23.....25
5:29.....42
5:30.....26
6:1.....26
6:14.....25
6:17.....23
6:17.....26
6:18.....26
6:21.....23
6:23.....25
6:26.....27
6:27.....27
6:29.....26
7:4.....24
7:5.....24
7:6.....24
7:7.....24
7:7.....25
7:7.....26
7:8.....68
7:8.....25
7:8.....68
7:10.....42
7:10.....82
7:13.....26
7:19.....68
7:19.....24
7:19.....24
7:19.....24
7:20.....25
7:20.....68
7:23.....26
7:24.....26
7:25.....26
8:11.....57
9:5.....72
9:12.....61
9:18.....53
9:24.....41
9:24.....61
11:10.....3a
11:10..... 4
11:10.....82
11:12.....73
11:18.....81
11:39.....55

EZRA

2:1.....85
2:46.....85
2:50.....85
3:3.....3a
3:3..... 8
4:2.....82
4:4.....33
4:7.....3a
4:9.....82
4:9.....28
4:11.....24
4:12..... 9
4:12.....42
5:1.....27
5:12.....26
5:15.....42
6:14.....27
6:16.....26
7:18.....25
7:18.....24
7:25.....23
7:25.....27
7:26.....42
8:14.....85
8:17.....34
8:17.....82
8:25.....21
10:2.....82
10:12.....61
10:29.....85
10:35.....85
10:37.....85
10:43.....85
10:44.....55

NEHEMIAH

2:13.....11
3:15.....82
3:20.....85
3:30.....42
3:31.....42
4:7.....37
4:9.....54
5:7.....43
5:9.....82
6:8.....43
7:3.....82
7:43.....85
7:52.....85
7:54.....85
9:6.....13
9:17.....82
10:20.....85
11:17.....85
12:9.....85
12:14.....85
12:16.....85
12:38.....83
12:46.....61
13:23.....31
13:23.....31

I CHRONICLES

1:11.....37
1:46.....85
1:51.....85
2:55.....55
3:24.....85
4:7.....85
4:20.....85
4:41.....85
6:11.....80
6:20.....85
7:1.....85
7:10.....35
7:31.....85
7:34.....31
7:34.....85
8:25.....36
9:4.....83
9:33.....35
9:35.....36
11:11.....81
11:20.....84
11:44.....36
12:3.....36
12:5.....85
12:15.....42
12:18.....80
14:1.....85
14:10.....37
15:24.....60
18:10.....30
20:5.....85
22:7.....81
23:9.....85
24:24.....34
25:1.....55
26:25.....85
27:12.....11
27:29.....85
29:16.....64

II Chronicles
3:17.....42
4:11.....85
5:12.....60
5:13.....60
7:6.....60
8:10.....80
8:18.....31
9:10.....85
9:29.....85
11:18.....82
13:14.....60
13:19.....85
17:8.....85
18:8.....85
18:33.....61
24:27.....80
26:3.....85
26:7.....37
26:11.....36
26:21.....42
29:8.....33
29:13.....36
29:14.....36
29:28.....60
31:12.....31
31:13.....31
32:21.....82
33:16.....81
34:5.....82
34:6.....10
34:9.....80
34:22.....31
34:25.....56
35:3.....82
35:4.....57
35:9.....31
36:14.....30
36:17.....37

INDEX OF MADINCHAE KETHIB-QERE PASSAGES

Note: The numbers refer to the lists in the Madinchae Classification.

JOSHUA

3:17.....77
6:15.....71
7:21.....50
8:12.....85
8:13.....81
15:53.....85
24:9.....53

JUDGES

1:21.....61
6:25.....82
8:3.....71
8:22.....63
11:31.....82
18:9.....63

I SAMUEL

4:15.....18
15:6.....67
18:25.....76
25:27.....80

II SAMUEL

3:35.....41
6:23.....41

I KINGS

10:22.....82
14:13.....71

II KINGS

17:4.....85
18:29.....66
25:12.....41

ISAIAH

23:12.....67
27:6.....73
38:14.....48
57:10.....15

JEREMIAH

6:6.....65
8:4.....61
9:21.....41
17:4.....56
22:14.....35
22:16.....86
26:24.....82
28:17.....86
29:7.....82
29:22.....85
32:11.....79
32:12.....77
32:34.....55
33:3.....41
36:23.....71
36:23.....73
37:19.....42
45:1.....69
45:4.....80
48:31.....18
48:31.....66
49:12.....55
49:19.....67
50:6.....18
51:59.....69

EZEKIEL

1:13.....86
5:11.....80
9:8.....82
10:11.....17
11:7.....86
13:2.....41
13:9.....71
13:17.....41
14:17.....86
16:29.....81
16:46.....86
16:48.....86
17:7.....33
17:14.....64
18:2.....77
18:20.....86
21:19.....86
22:4.....82
22:13.....41
23:19.....51
23:46.....33
26:17.....86
30:18.....86
32:16.....86
32:26.....80
36:5.....42
40:2.....82
40:3.....82
40:25.....70
42:8.....41
43:26.....73
44:3.....82
46:6.....63
46:6.....69
46:8.....82
46:21.....64
48:28.....61

HOSEA

4:12.....82
14:5.....66

JOEL

1:12.....32
1:12.....72
2:22.....42
4:7.....42

AMOS

9:7.....81

MICAH

5:1.....42
6:5.....80

NAHUM

2:12.....86
3:8.....60
3:11.....82

HABAKKUK

3:18.....42

ZEPHANIAH

2:7.....67
2:7.....81
3:11.....12

ZECHARIAH

4:10.....82
13:7.....66

MALACHI

3:22.....41

PSALMS

22:24.....55
43:3.....82
109:4.....82
137:5.....16

PROVERBS

5:19.....61
8:19.....66
18:20.....42
21:31.....42
31:7.....42

JOB

5:5.....73
6:21.....81
10:17.....82
17:10.....55
18:13.....82
22:24.....55
23:13.....66
30:13.....29
34:14.....41
37:19.....66
40:12.....41
41:2.....56

RUTH

1:6.....54
1:6.....86
2:11.....78
3:5.....79

LAMENTATIONS
3:22.....3a
3:32.....3a

ECCLESIASTES
7:2.....77
9:9.....65
12:12.....42

DANIEL
5:18.....81

EZRA
10:3.....71
10:29.....73

NEHEMIAH
6:2.....42
7:15.....85
12:35.....85
13:10.....18

I CHRONICLES
5:14.....85
6:29.....85
7:36.....85
10:14.....42
17:6.....66

II CHRONICLES
4:1.....77
24:24.....82
33:13.....82

INDEX OF BIBLICAL PASSAGES

Only passages receiving a new or unfamiliar interpretation are included. Numbers refer to pages. N. refers to the Notes to the Classification (pp. 167–205).

Ex	6:4	41
	16:35	42
Lev	20:10	42
	23:13	93, n. 79a
Deut	33:7	n. 193
Josh	2:7	42
	18:19	42
Jud	6:5	145, n. 437
	19:3	139, n. 384
I Sam	27:4	134, n. 297
II Sam	15:8	42
	16:10	148, n. 472
	16:12	148, n. 473
	18:8	137, n. 339
	19:32	42
	21:20	149, n. 477
I Kings	7:45	149, n. 481
II Kings	6:25	86, n. 3
	17:13	149, n. 485
Isa	9:2	155, n. 577
	10:13	151, n. 540
	42:24	135, n. 322a
Jer	2:11	42
	4:19	102, n. 122c
	6:21	145, n. 439
	15:11	149, n. 492
	19:2	125, n. 202
	26:6	125, n. 203
	29:23	149, n. 494
Ezek	3:15	43
	9:8	43
Hos	8:12	149, n. 497
Micah	1:8	131, n. 273
Zech	1:4	125, n. 214
	14:6	149, n. 499
Ps	10:9	94, n. 88
	10:10	99, n. 114
	45:14	n. 218
	56:7	135, n. 316
	102:24	59
	144:2	27
Prov	19: 7	156, n. 584
	20:21	124, n. 180
	28:23	n. 242
Job	10:20	150, n. 512
Ruth	4:4	27
Lam	1:11	126, n. 227
	2:13	134, n. 308
	5:18	43
Ecc	6:10	43
Esther	9:19	43, 126, n. 229
Neh	3:30	127, n. 242
II Chron	33:13	76

INDEX OF RABBINIC PASSAGES

Passages merely referred to are not included. Numbers refer to pages. N. refers to the Notes to the Classification (pp. 167–205).

MISHNAH

Megillah 4:2 . . . . . 18, 40
Sotah 5:5 50
Sanhedrin 10:1 30
Aboth 3:20 33

BABYLONIAN TALMUD

Shabbat 63a 28
Pesahim 22b 46
50a 30
Megillah 19a . . . . . n. 229
25a 30
28b 78
Kethubboth 106a 41
Nedarim 10a . . . . . n. 245
37b 77
Kiddushin 57a 46
Sanhedrin 4b 45
20a 77
Shebuoth 26a 46
Hullin 3a . . . . . n. 129

MINOR TRACTATES

Aboth de Rabbi Nathan ch. 34 . . . 44
Sopherim 6:4 . . . . . 18, 40

MIDRASH

Mechilta, Bo, Pitcha 2 . . . n. 180
Bereshith Rabbah 15:12 77
Debarim Rabbah, sec. 2 77
Pesikta Rabbathi (ed. Friedmann) p. 131b . . . . . n. 405

GENERAL INDEX

Numbers refer to pages.

Abrabanel, 12
Akiba, 45 f.
Al tikre formula, 78
Amama, 13
Archaisms, 22, 49, 101 f.
Archetype, 34, 44, 67
Aquila and Kethib-Qere, 63 f.; and Madinchae, 73

Bamberger, 13, 28
Buhl, 12
Buxtorf, 9

Capellus, 14
Carpzov, 9, 11
Classification of Kethib-Qere, 83–158
Correction theory of Kethib-Qere, 12ff., 19.
Conflation, 41 ff., 49

Derenbourg, 14
De Wette, 11
Dillmann, 11
Dotted Words, 44
Duran, 9

Eclectic theory of Kethib-Qere, 13, f., 28
Ehrentreu, 27
Eichhorn, 11
Euphemisms, 16, 30, 86

Frankel, 11, 60

Geiger, 40
Gesenius, 11
Ginsburg, C. D., 13
Ginzberg, L., 51
Graetz, 34
Grammatical material in Kethib-Qere: asseverative Kaph, 201; diphthongal *ai*, 100; older imperative, 107; nouns feminine suffix, 103; paragogic Yod, 103; participle passive Qal tertiae Yod verbs, 105; pausal cohortatives, 106; primae Yod verbs, 29; verbs perfect feminine plural, 104; verbs feminine suffix, 101.
Guides to the Reader, 86 ff.

Hapax legomena in Qere, 23
Hiller 10, 25

Idra 1
Inscriptions, Mesha, Siloam 31

Kethib-Qere formula, 77; homiletic use of 78 f.; pronunciation of, 7
Kethib-Qere, number of, 8; relative value of, 23, 82
Kethib vela Qere 52, 148
Kimhi, 9
Koenig, 11

Lambert, 12
Law, Jewish, Kethib-Qere in 15 f., 39
Levias, 14
Luzzatto, 55

Madinchae Kethib-Qere, 70 ff.; classification of, 159 ff.; and Versions, 71–78
Margolis, 55
Masorah, 1, 33
Mishnah, Kethib-Qere quotations in, 51
Morinus, 13
Morphological Kethib-Qere, 117, 127
Mystical theory of Kethib-Qere, 13, 28

Nahum of Gimzo, 46
Noeldeke, 48

Ochlah v'Ochlah, 34 ff., 37
Orthography, Biblical, 32
Orthographical Kethib-Qere, 98 ff.

Parallel passages, 25
Peshitta and Kethib-Qere 64, 66; and Madinchae, 73
Phonetic variants in Kethib-Qere, 110 ff.

Qere vela Kethib, 52, 147

Ranke, 29
Reach, 26
Rhetorical variants in Kethib-Qere, 140
Rosenfeld, 14, 20

Sebirin, 26 f.
Septuagint, 50, 60 ff., 65; and Madinchae, 71; Manuscripts and Kethib-Qere, 62

Simon, 11, 13
Spurious Kethib-Qere, 67 ff.
Strack, 13
Symmachus, 66; and Madinchae, 73

Talmud, Kethib-Qere quotations in, 51 f.; and Madinchae, 77.
Targum, 64, 66; and Madinchae, 74 ff.
Tetragrammaton, 29, 85
Theodotion, 66; and Madinchae, 73
Tikune Sopherim, 44

Variation theory of Kethib-Qere, 9 ff.; 15 ff.
Versions and Kethib-Qere, totals, 65, 66; and Madinchae, totals, 78; method of use of, 55 ff.
Vocalization, history of Hebrew 31 ff., 34 ff.
Vulgate, 64, 66; and Madinchae, 74

Walton, 11
Wellhausen, 13, 17

Date Due

FACULTY
W 8 '46
MY 6-'54
JUN 15 1972

BS1185 .G66
The Biblical text in the making;
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00011 9000